

# THE REPLIE OF

JOHN DARRELL, TO THE AN-

SWER OF IOHN DEACON, AND

*John Walker*, concerning the doctrine of the  
Possession and Dispossession of  
Demoniacs.

*Ecclesiastes 4. 1.*

*I turned, and considered all the oppressions that are wrought under  
the sun, and behold, the tears of the oppressed, & none comforteth them:  
and for the strength is of the hand of them that oppress them, and none  
comforteth them.*



Imprinted 1603.

THE PEOPLE OF  
THE STATE OF NEW YORK  
IN SENATE  
JANUARY 1, 1890  
AND  
IN ASSEMBLY  
JANUARY 1, 1890  
REPORT  
OF THE  
COMMISSIONERS OF THE  
LAND OFFICE  
IN RESPONSE TO A  
RESOLUTION PASSED  
BY THE SENATE  
JANUARY 1, 1890  
AND BY THE ASSEMBLY  
JANUARY 1, 1890

ALBANY: PUBLISHED BY THE  
UNIVERSITY OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK  
1890



ALBANY: PUBLISHED BY THE  
UNIVERSITY OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK  
1890



# TO THE RIGHT RE-

VEREND FATHERS AND BRETHREN,

the Pastors and Teachers in the Church of Eng-  
land, Grace and peace be multiplied  
in our Lord Iesus Christ.

IT had bene to be wished (right Reuerend & beloved in our Lord Iesus Christ) that some question arising of late, as you know, concerning *Dispossession of diuels in these times by fasting and prayer*, the same might haue bene propounded, examined, and decided in your lawful assembly. For your senses being exercised in the knowledge of God his truth, and your minds enlightened with continuall practise of the Church, would easily haue discerned the stampe of the Sanctuarie: and this iudiciall determination of yours, would (no doubt) either haue prevented, or stayed at least much violent proceeding, manie impious assertions, and great distractions among the people, which not able to iudge of the substance of things, stand amazed at the vaine sound and multitude of words. But as this happinesse hath bin much wished in like case heretofore, so neuer could it be lesse hoped for then now, when our sinnes haue breathed new life into the dead carke of Antichrist, whereby hee startles vp on his secte afresh, and begins to strout amongst vs againe in terrible sort, yet notwithstanding your ioint consents cannot be had, I thought it meet to offer this Reioynder to your considerations severally, holding it most requisite that you the same parties should also heare Truth speake in her iust defence, before whom, and to whom, shee hath bene slandered most shamefully. But what Truth is able to pleade for her selfe shall more fully appeare in the Treatise following: now onely she craueth, that as *Gregorie Nazianzen* iudged of *Salian* by the wagging of his head, so by these two Epistles of theirs, one to your selves, the other to the Reader, it would please you to regard what disposition these Answers bee.

In their Epistle to you (reuerend brethren) you shall beholde them false in pretence, vntrue in their words, and ridiculously arrogant. For pretence, they make shew of great promptnesse with all humilitie to submit their opinions to your great and learned censures. And who would not esteeme this lowlinesse, as if the men were lately descended from heauen? But alas, they know your pub-

## THE EPISTLE.

like censure is not to be feared: more waightie occasions haue not  
 hether to procure it: and what any of you shall pronounce pri-  
 uately, will be but one Doctors opinion with them. Their practise  
 makes this plaine in their *Discourses*, where testimonies as cleare as  
 the sunne light alleaged, how the Church both ancient and present  
 hath demeaned her selfe in like actions, they not hauing one word  
 of probabilitie to reply, would shift off the matter with shame-  
 lesse outfacings. Is it likely nowe (worthie Fathers and Bre-  
 thren) these men would reuerence your authoritie, who reiect  
 without blushing the authoritie of them, whom all the learned de-  
 feruedly reuerence? This profession then is but a meere abuse, ser-  
 uing onely for a maske to hide the deformity of their natural coun-  
 tenance. And as they would carrie a faire colour of that, they neuer  
 purpose to doe, so also they be no lesse vntrue in reporting things  
 already past. They tell you, *How insalently we denied the Christian  
 conference they profered vs:* whereas they neuer profered me any: and  
 as for *M. Moore*, they comming to him, promising to confer the  
 next morning, neuer came to him afterwards: thinking it better to  
 cracke their credit in breaking that promise, then to stand to their  
 word, & receiue a foyle in the bickering. So they talk of a *new con-  
 ference with me, offered to my speciall friends:* when neither friend nor  
 foe knew where I was: when also had they knowne, and signified  
 vnto me this profered conference, I might with small securitie to  
 my person haue conferred with them, notwithstanding their profe-  
 red bond. Whereby you may see that occasion was rather sought to  
 blind the world with, then that any conference was soundly intended.  
 In like manner they affirming, that dispossellion in these times by  
 fasting & prayer be miracles: that they bee vrged as necessary to  
 support our Religion: *that there is no difference between them wrought in  
 the church of god among vs, & these done in Antichrists kingdom:* that  
 the deeds, and these actions are to be matched with *Brownists & Hacketts:*  
 are assertions of such nature as might with good reason, were they  
 true, enrage your meek & patient spirits with indignation: specially  
 wh<sup>o</sup> you heare their principal end in publishing these *Confels of God  
 lately revealed vnto them concerning these intricate questions* (for so they  
 speake of these fancies or rather frensies of theirs in the Treatise  
 following) was forsooth to accomplish the peace of Ierusalem. Are  
 nouelties peaceable? Innovations fit for quiet? Doctrines neuer  
 heard of before, procurers of concord? O blessed peacemakers,  
 which would soulder vp the breaches and disagreements of Ierusa-  
 lem

# THE EPISTLE.]

lem with *latelic reuealed counsels*. Thus they dare to your faces poure forth their vntruths, not onely in matter of faith, wherein none but some speciall persons could conuict them: but also in doctrines, whose falshood your selues are best able of all other to descry as soone as you heare them. And is not their arrogancy worthy to be laughed at (but that your manner is rather to bewaile mens folly) when they would be *Magistri sententiarum*, & haue their Discourses Dictates for young students in diuinitie? It were handsom sure to behold a Sow sit with a distaffe teaching the fine Ladies to spin: that the Crow should instruct the young Nightingales to sing: and that the Conduites in Cheape should be fed from the publike draynes & sinkes of the citie. But could they bee content to be directours only to the younger students? These mysteries of theirs are an *infallible truth*, as they say, & *Counsels of god lately reuealed vnto them*, as you heard euen now. And therefore your selues, learned Fathers, though much travelled in the sacred scriptures, greatly read in ancient writers, & acquainted with later monuments of knowledge & experience of all kinde, yet hitherto in these poyntes you know nothing: & if you purpose hereafter to vnderstand any thing, you must sucke it onely from the breasts of these *late Reuelations*. In which regarde it may very well bee, these *Answers* could greatly reioyce (as also they professe) if it might please any of you to cōfute them, because they thinke theselues on so sure a ground, & are tickled, as it seemeth with an imagination of that glory, which they suppose they should gaine by your foile & discredit. Whether they wil accept such a labour in good part or no, you shall haue experience by this I haue performed. Their former pretences make me to feare this outside of theirs is but ouercast with their wonted perietting.

In the Epistle to the Reader they say that I haue *very vncharitably endeouored to wound S. H.* (whom els where they call *S. Harsnet* vnto death for his dutifull Discoverie. I maruell they are not ashamed to call it a *dutifull discoverie*, seeing the drift of it is, to proue, that I *taunge Sommers to counterfeit*, wherof themselves acquit me, as ye shall heare forthwith. What *dutie* performed he to God or man, in slaundering the rare workes of god, & his neighbour? Or do they in commending such a Discoverie. It is true that by my *Drection* I endeouored to wound *S. H. mortally*, so as he should neuer be able to rise vp any more for counterfeiting & my teaching to counterfeit: but not with sword, nor speare, onely with the dart of Truth. And I thinke it is as true that I haue *wounded him to death*.

## THE EPISTLE.

Had not his wounds bene mortall, or at leastwise incurable, they had beene healed by this, and we had seene him the second time in the field. Otherwise we must deem him for a coward, that encountereth not his enemy being often challenged. This is the excellency & power of truth that shee subdueth all those that rise vp in armes against her, & they that take part with her, do at length triumph gloriously, as being more then conquerors. They blame my *pamphlets as full of unsound & absurd positions*. I wil not confirme in this place, what is els where set down, but refer to your Iudgement whether by the former *Survey*, & the following *Reply* it doth not appeare that many *such positions* haue issued from their owne heads, & that this charge may be turned vpon their owne pates. For *manner*, they charge my writings with want of *Method*: to bee also *schismaticall* and *Enigmati- cally*. Touching the *Method*, I hope your patience hath beene contented with the order of the *Doctrine*, diuided into three severall branches & each part prosecuted first with reasons confirming it: & after by remoouing such doubtles as might seeme to weaken it. And as for *Schisme*, I teach no Latelie *reuealed counsels*, nor my *private opinion concerning the possession & dispossession of duels*. Both which these men confesse they do, but what hath ben reuealed and held from the beginning & confirmed euery since by continual consent: whereas if their doctrines be *their owne private opinions*, and *Latelie reuealed*, they bee New. If New, not established by agreement of Scriptures & the Church: & if not established, it is *schisme* at the least, for any thing I can conceive, to publish & maintein them. Concerning *Enigmati- cally* handling, your owne profiting by reading may best be Iudge. It was not my purpose, neyther is it my skill to write riddles: Yet because they complaine of darkenes I haue now so induored my selfe, that I hope they may spell my meaning, if they put on their spectacles. Moreouer they accuse the *spirit* wherewith my pamphlets are indited, to be *sensuall & deuillish*, as giuen to *Rayling*, *Contradiction*, & *Disobedience*. Horrible, indeed is the sinne of *Rayling*. But iust & plaine reprouing with these men is railing: Curing is killing, & whatsoeuer smarteth in the sore, is deadly poyson. *The morning to the adulterer, is as the shadow of death*. The vlcerous patient cryeth out on euery touch of the Chirurgeon, as at most rough & vnaduised handling. It is no metuall if the *Cretians* can not endure to be told, they are *hyars, euil beasts, & bellies*: & that sharpe reproofe be reuiled by such, as altogether in tollerable, barbarous, and inhumane. Yet further behold I beseech you in

*Dialog.  
Discomf.  
Epist. to  
the Reader  
in the be-  
ginning.*

*Iob. 24. 17.*

*Tit. 1. 12.*

## THE EPISTLE.

themselves, how destitute they are of Gods feare in this behalfe: how voyd of the common wisdom of men: & how strongly possessed with that self same itching disease they charge me withall. It is great want of reuerence towards god to defame others falsely, & that against their owne consciences, as they doe me most opprobriously throughout their whole treatises: It is exceeding folly to provoke him by forged crimes, which can repay them againe with most true crimes, with publike crimes, with hainous crimes. And is it not an incurable itching which must needs be clawing, till their own flesh be rent from their bones? These mens desire of scratching was so hot, that possibly they could not hold their fingers, though they were guilty to them selues, how deare it might cost them: wherein notwithstanding I haue spared them, being ashamed in playne tearmes to vtter that which they haue not bene ashamed to do. Concerning the *Contradictions* they would thrust vpon me, you will easily perceiue in the *Reply*, how partly they spring from their owne ignorance, as if I cal a thing *Ordinary* and *supernatural*, then must there needs be a *Contradiction*: partly from their adding, detracting, and changing my words at their pleasure, which they haue done aduersely and purposely, whereby their sin is increased: And as for *Disobedience by my striving against the sentence of the High Commission*: is it a rebellious and vnruly proceeding according to the commandement & example of Christ Iesus to iustifie the works of *Matt. 12.* god being slandered, or yet for one to complaine of wrong. For *25. 30.* marke I beseech you how in this place they affirming, that by due order of law wee were conuicted, committed, apprehended, imprisoned, by sentence of Iustice definitively condemned for grosse malefactors, & adiudged to prison: yet in their *Discourses* haue given this testimonie of me, that they did not so much as suspect any precompact or confederacy betweene me and the boy, that all acquainted with my former Sinceritie and vpright carriage are free from such a persuasion: that the gracieles boy did gracielesly counterfet, and my self did only erre in iudgement, and not of any purpose in praetise at all. By the witnes therfore of this world if the high Commission passed any such sentence against vs they did vs open iniury: & I trust oppressed innocents may baire this libertie at least to bewaile their greife. But neither haue the Commission awarded any such sentence, and these men haue done a double notable wrong in slandering both the Commission, and vs. To shut vp all, they would hoodwink the reader with their godly ieaousie ouer him, pretending they labour to prepare him for one

*Dialg. Disf.*  
*pag. 352.*

## THE EPISTLE.

**1. Tim. 3.** husband, and to present him as a pure virgin to Christ. But this office belongeth to the Bishop that is blameles, and is the husband of one wife, &c. as S. Paul saith. And therefore if the Christiā Reader should looke for grapes from these thornes, he should be deceaued. this Epistle then to the Reader is fraught with the same vertues of Cloaking, of forging, of pride (though with some larger addition) wherewith the former, reuerend Fathers and brethren, was to you. And therefore howsoever they thinke, I wil answere them as Hildebrand did, *Abbas Cassinensis, frater nimium tardasti*: Deere brethren, you haue beene somewhat too slow in publishing your *Dialogicall Discourses*: yet I doubt not, but both you, and I, will with one consent, rather returne the contrarie to them, *Et vos Disputatores nimium festinastis*: And you, O Discourfers, haue made too much haste. For had you travelled as long, as the Elephant in bringing forth her young, yet the birth of such monstrous deuises, so ignorant, so erroneous, so slaunderous, so impious, had bene abortiue, vntimely, and too soon. For this cause I haue dealt more roundly and freely with them, then otherwise I would haue done with ordinarie men. They could not possibly be wakened out of so strong an Apoplexie, but by burning feathers and shoo-soles vnder their noses: neither would the Reader haue bene sufficiently warned to eschew their fraud, except the trumpet had sounded shrill in his eares.

And whereas some of you, reuerend and beloued brethren, affirming, and verie truly, that their bookes were vnworthy the answering, did thereupon earnestly dissuade me from writing: I answered, So also was the doctrine of those vaine talkers, Paul mentioneth to Titus, vnworthy so be confuted, yet the Apostle saith, *Their mouthes must be stopped*. And how? by convincing, as there followeth.

**Tit. 1. 10.** What could be more palpable false, then that of the Pharisees, *Hee casteth out devils, through Beelzebub the Prince of devils*. Norwithstanding our Saviour did conuince the. Euen so did S. Peter those who

**Mat. 12. 24.** mocked, and said the Apostles were full of new wine, when the holy Ghost in that wonderful manner fell vpon them. In priuate communication, A foole is to be answered according to his folly: but if in public like among the presse, in the highest places of the citie, or entrings of the gates, where wisdomes voice should be heard, a foole chance to babble, and utter that is dangerous to the simple, which these Discourfers haue done, then is the folly of a foole to bee thoroughly discovered, and layd open to the viewe of all men. The foolish (of

**1. Cor. 14. 35** which number are the most) will beleene euery thing, be it neuer so



## THE EPISTLE.

false, be it neuer so absurd, neuer so sottish & ridiculous, specially if it be countenanced with Authority, as are the *Dialog call Discourses*. For this reason, euen to keepe the simple from error, who are so easilie seduced, notwithstanding the vnworthines of these *Discourses*, there is cause something should be sayd in answere vnto them, by my selfe or other. Neither doe I doubt but these my rude lines will (by the blessing of God) be effectual to recouer those which through their verbal writings be false from the truth, to strengthen such as be wauering, and to establish them which more firmly hold the truth. If this successe follow, I shall haue no cause to repent me of my paines, nor any other to account the same superfluous.

Now therefore, brethren, I beseech you know these disturbers, be not deceiued by their ouercasting and smoothing. Examine what they say, before ye beleue them. And albeit your authority is not able to bridle them (the more is our grieffe, and the miserie of our Church) yet auoid their doctrines in your selues, and in your people. I beseech you also, as your occasions may serue, admonish them: that yet in want of a publike degree, they may gather by you seuerally what is the iudgement of all, and be thereby ashamed and reclaimed, if so the Lord in mercy please. Little needes such conflict in these times wherein that antichrist of Rome extremely rageth, as now entring his last triall. But we must haue fightings without and feares within: open wars with the preists and Iesuites, the seruants of Antichrist, and many priuate grieuances by such as would bee counted of the household of faith. It behooues vs therefore brethren, to put on the armor of righteousnes on the right hand, and on the left, that wee may manfully defend & mainteine the holy truth in all her bounds & limits vniolated sincere where by the puritie of Religion may still bee continued, and all error abandoned fro annoying either vs or our posteritie after vs. The god of mercy, peace and truth confirme and establish our heartes, that we may fight the good fight, like good soldiers of Iesus Christ, and quit our selues like men: holding faith & a good conscience, to the glory of his name, & euerlasting comfort of our owne soules, through Iesus our Lord and onely Sauour. Amen.

2. Cor. 7.

5.

2. Cor. 6.7

Your fellow seruant in the worke of  
the Gospell.

Iohn Darrell.





# THE REPLIE TO

## THE FIRST DIALOGVE.

IT is a cunning sleight to beguile the simple with, in propounding to satisfy the world for any thing that hath bene sayd concerning the poynts and parties controuerted, wholly to omit the books called the *Triall*, the *Detection*, the *Narration* of seuen possessed in *Lancashire*, contayning in them matters of fact, and onely to bend your forces against one Treatise called *The Doctrine*, &c. The reason of which omission, Christian Reader, is this, To disproue things done, so euidently knowne to so many eye-witnesses, were all one as to perswade that white is blacke, that fire is Ice, that it is dark night in the cleare sunshine, which whoso should endeuer would rather be esteemed of all a mad mā, thē gaine any credit to his cause. But in points and controuerfies of doctrine there was more hope to deceiue. For here through multitude of words, ambiguous tearmes, fraudulent courses of reasoning, false coloured sentences, wrested and misconstrued scriptures, abused authorities of famous men, and such other deuises, not onely the ignorant & vnable to search the truth should be blinded, but also many learned, which before had not weighed these things, neither perhaps would take the paines to sift and try them to the prooffe, might be stricken with some amase & doubt. Only they whose iudgments are seasoned with sound vnderstanding, which at first sight are able to discerne the crooked writings of peeuish and foolish sophisters, and know without book the scope of most mens writings in account amongst the learned, would giue true sentence of the cause, and condemne the se opinions of ignorance and error. But the number of such is smal, and therefore by these *Answers* was lesse regarded. This, whatsoeuer they pretend, was the true ground of their choise, yet though they will not meddle with the *Triall*, and *Detection*, they must bicker a blow or two with the *Epistles* of both. To let passe the disgraces, wherewith they lade them: for the *Triall* I may say (for therof am not I author) I doubt not but iudiciall men will acknowledge more sound learning in some fewe lines of it, then is in the whole bundle of your foolish *Discourses*. To come to that which is material, you charge the *Triall* but with two things, & in this charge make four lies, such is your compendious facultie. First, say you, it matcheth your pretended

pag. 3. 9.  
10.

pag. 3.

## REPLIE TO

*Epist. pag. 4.* tended miracle, with the true miracles of Christ. The words of the Epistle speaking to the L. Popham, bee these, *And concerning as highly the glory of Christ our Saviour, as it doth the credit of a faithfull minister.* Is here any comparison of miracles? Is here any mention of miracles at all? Doth it say any more, but this cause being about a worke done in the name of Christ, doth as highly concerne his glory, as my credit? Again, say you, *the prelates are charged with the sin against the Holy Ghost.* I hus speaketh the Epistle, *that the prelates (which now set themselves against dispossession) be guiltie of this unpardonable sin, I wil not say. If I wil not say, be I do say, thē the prelates are charged with this sin.* Out of this branch spring two other, That you report the Epistle to labour the L. Chiefe Iustice to reconer himself with speed fro that fearefull sin, wherunto it seemes he is fearefully falling: and that he would reuerse iudgement passed against me. He which writ the Epistle did not dote, as you do, to entitle his Honour, an *vpright, and worthy, and a righteous iudge*, to desire and vrge his Lordship, to releue the oppressed innocent, specially, to take to heart the slanders giuen out of the works of God: and within a few lines after to place him in the verie brinke of reprobation. Neither doth he perswade to a *Reuersing of iudgement* (for there was none passed, as the Authour knew well enough) but to a *second bearing, as Felix heard Paul the second time.* Now then let the Reader tell me, if you bee not pitthie liars, that can comprehend so many in so little roome.

*Pag. 5.* For my Detection you charge the Title as *vndutifull against her Maesties iudiciall proceedings*, for that it is so sharpe against *M. Harfners* booke. It is more then I knowe, or can beleue, that her Maiestie commanded *M. Harfner* to write: or that her Right Honorable Counsell inioined him so much, or that the high Cōmission laid this vpon him. It may be, if his owne vainglorious humor, which euer tooke pleasure to be biting of others, did not prick him forward to this busines, yet that the B. his maister, of his priuat authoritie, did set him his taske, to salue this owne credit, and of such as had ioined in disgracing the truth. But I hope one may reprehēd some priuat actions of the B. without any vndutifulnes to her maiesties proceedings. You then are malicious pikthanks, which haue nothing in your mouthes, but *Ad leones, ad leones, He is not Cēsars friend.*

For the Epistle, you charge me *with reviling the B.* I answer, It was not anie contempt or malice towards his person, or forgetfulness of any dutie to authoritie, that moued me to such seueritie, as I vsed, but onely feare least otherwise I should haue failed in dutie towards

# THE FIRST DIALOGVE.

3

towards God. *Those which sinne, saith the Apostle, reprove openly:* And *1.7. m. 5. 20*  
*reprove with all authoritie.* And when I heare *Iohn Baptist calling* *Tit. 2. 15.*  
*the Pharisees Decemners, and Generations of vipers:* when I heare our *Matth. 3.*  
*Sauour most sharply reprovuing them by the names of Persecutors,* *Matth. 23.*  
*serpents, generation of vipers, the children of bell, painted sepulchers, and*  
*such like:* And *S. Paul speaking to Elymas, O full of all subtilty, and* *Act. 13. 9.*  
*all mischiefe, the child of the diuell, and enemy of all righteousness:* cal- *10.*  
*ling also false prophets Dogges, and the Cretians beasts:* yea when I *Philip. 3. 2.*  
*heare Eliiah call Ahab, the troubler of Israel:* our Sauour tearme He- *Tit. 1. 12.*  
*rod a foxe, Paul entituling Ananias a painted wall, and Nero by the* *1. King. 18.*  
*name of a Lyon:* I hefe and manie such other places of practise, give *Act. 23.*  
*me some light for vnderstanding the precept, and teach me, that al-* *2. Tim. 4. 17.*  
*beit in my priuate cause I am to vse all mildenesse and gentlenesse,*  
*yet when the Lords truth is interestted and slandered, his greate*  
*mercie obicured, and that of purpose and wilfully, neither one Ser-*  
*gius by Elymas hindered, but manie thousands turned backe from*  
*beleeuing his works, from praising him for them, and profiting by*  
*them, in this case the man of authority is no lesse to be stricken*  
*with the edge of reproofe, then he that is in inferiour place. Nay,*  
*rather the publike person, then the priuate man, by how much his*  
*example is more dangerous, either forcing or alluring great multi-*  
*tudes to imbrace his error. And this doth not hinder but with Da-*  
*uid, & Stephen, and our Sauour himselfe, and all the holy martyrs of* *pag. 6.*  
*God, wee should pray for our persecutors, and blesse them which curse*  
*vs: for reproofe and hatred be not necessarily linked together, but*  
*Reproofe is a notable remedie to preferue from hatred, according*  
*to that the Lord saith, Thou shalt not hate thy brother in thy heart, but* *Louis. 19. 17.*  
*thou shalt plainly rebuke thy neighbour, and suffer him not to sinne. But*  
*this is your maner, to huddle vp all things in a confused heape to-*  
*gether, and that which is spoken with certaine prouisoies and limi-*  
*tations, to allage it as a bare and simple commaund. Thus much*  
*for the Epistles.*

Yet before you come to the Treatise, you will admonish the Rea-  
der of two cunning sleights of legerdemaine, practised by me, ibroughout *pag. 7:*  
that my Pamphlets: whereof the first is, That I haue slyly ouerslipped what  
is materiall in M. Harfnetts Discovery, as, to make good that distinction of  
Mirandum & Miraculum, which be both dashed to nothing. I answered,  
that as becommeth true natural Leopards, you cannot change your  
skinne, but you must needs be lying heere, as almost euerie where  
else: for I haue replied to M. Harfnet out of Angustine and Danaus,

D

so wing

# REPLIE TO

*Detection,*  
ag. 6.

*Dialog.*  
pag. 209. &  
310.

*S. Harf. Disc.*  
28. 29.

*shewing an apparant difference betweene a Wonder and a Miracle. And further haue I answered in suruey of your tenth Dialogue: from whence I pray you tell M. Harfuet, that if he remember the difference betweene Genus and Species, he may feele with his finger that a Wonder and a Miracle be not all one. And if this will not suffice him, demaund of him, whether Antichrist by the power of Satan worketh not wonders: and whether he esteeme all those wonders to be true miracles. And as touching your selues who accord with M. Harfuet herein, what say you to these words of your owne? The diuell may worke wonders, as Simon Magus hath done: but hee can effect no miracles. And in another place. A thing effected by essentiall means, howsoeuer it may be a wonder, yet no miracle in any respect. How can you possibly free your selues here from a contradiction? And this is my reply to your first instance. Againe, say you, M. Harfuet accusing verie orderly by Sommers testimony, mine owne answers, and severall depositions: this his materiall proceeding is pretermitted with silence. What? haue I written a Detection of his lying Discouerie, and haue touched nothing concerning Sommers testimonie, mine owne answers, and the severall depositions? Then haue I written nothing at all: For there be scarce anie lines in it, which concerne not one of these three. But thereof let the world iudge. I can say no more. I hope I haue shewed how indirect a course it is, that Sommers by threats, flatterings and promises of maintenance shoulde first be brought to accuse himselfe, after me, and then to witnesse against me: that mine owne answers should be curtalled, and stretched after the Discoverers pleasures: that the depositions which were against their likings should be suppressed, and others published, so far forth, as might giue occasion of doubt to the Reader. What dare not you auouch, which are so bold to affirme that, whereof the contrary appeares in every mans hand? If your meaning were that in some particular I haue pretermitted this, which your words will not beare, then you should haue done well to haue named that Particular, as the nature of an Instance requireth, which seeing you haue not done, it is thereby plaine, your selues be rather guiltie of *legerdmaine*, then I. Those pages which you quote in the margine, I grant I passed ouer, for that they concerne others, and not my selfe, as also because the matter was frivolous and vnworthy answer, as may there appeare, vrging the being of a thing by no other reason, but because such a thing might be. But marke what a faire threed these men haue spun, and how seeking to discredit my*

## THE FIRST DIALOGVE.

my *Detection*, they haue brought not a little credite vnto it. For I will hence proue, that in my *Detection* I haue not let passe one materiall point of *M. Harsnets Discouery* vnanswered: and namely thus. If *Darrell* haue in his *Detection* let goe anie materiall point of the *Discouery* vnanswered, then would the *Discoarsers* haue giuen some instances of such omission, where they endeuer to proue the same by instances: But the *Discoarsers* instancing to that end, haue giuen not so much as one instance of such omission: Ergo *Darrell* in his *Detection* hath not let goe any one materiall point in the *Discouery* vnanswered.

My second cunning sleight by your saying is, that I disgrace by pag. 8. 9.  
all meanes *Sommers* testimonie, produced against me but extoll it for me, upholding by it the signes of Possession & Dispossession. That no credit is to be giue to his lying testimony, I auouch it indeed in the place by you cited: but where do I uphold the signes of possession & dispossession by *Sommers* his testimonie, wherewith you charge me? why do not you also cite some place for this? You thought if one part of your assertion were true, the Reader would pardon you for the rest. It is such nouelty for you to speake truth, that any lide is to be accepted at your hands.

From the *Epistle* of the *Detection* you come to the *Narration*, the prooue wherof you will not haue to depend vpon report of the fact but vpon continuance of *Essentiall Possessions* and *Dispossession* in these times. A ridiculous thing, and to be hissed at. The reason why you eschew to deale against *master of saet*, I haue sufficiently declared in the beginning. Well I wil follow you in your course, & come to your *Answer* to the *Doctrine*. Which treatise, to admit such an hotchpotch as you say, (though sober men will iudge it, let downe in such order as is conuenient) it is not for euery one to cooke his matters so artificially as your *Discourfing gallimaufrey* is: but the more skil it wantes, the more credit for truth it ought to haue, seeing it raised simply as bare nature giues, without commendation of any *libertine*. First for *Essentiall possession* you reprove me or at least *Exorcistes*, for arguing from the word *Possession* out of the *General* translation, whereas I no where, nor any man else, inferre *essentiall* inherencie from the word *Possession*, as I haue shewed in the *Struety* of your *Dialog. Discourse*: yet is the same confuted by the *Originall*, by *Erasmus*, *Beza*, *Castalis*, and *Montanus*. But this was your voluntarie perhaps, before you came to your medicine: Now let vs heare your set and meditated song. Whereas I argue a possession that The pag. 10. 11.  
pag. 12. 134  
actions

13. 14. *actions or passions which the parties endured were supernaturall, and therefore proceeded from supernaturall causes.* You deny the actions were supernaturall, and that for three reasons. First, *Naturall causes have had more wonderful effects:* which I think I have sufficiently answered in the beginning of your seventh Dialogue. Now therefore in one word, Is nothing supernaturall in any creature, which is exceeded by anie other worke in nature? Then the foming, wallowing, the breaking of chaines asunder, reported of Demoniakes in the Gospel were not supernaturall, because something more wonderful may come from a naturall cause: as that mentioned by you of the little fish *Echneis*, which (being but halfe a foote long) if thee but once cleave to the side of a ship, wil compel it perforce to stand still, notwithstanding the violence of the wind or oare. I am ashamed to heare men thus absurd. You might have considered, had your wits bene your owne, that these actions or passions are not therefore supernaturall, and so called, because they are more wonderful then anie thing issuing from nature, which a naturall would scarce affirme: but partly because they are (for the most part) above that, and more wonderfull then the nature of man can lend forth: and partly in respect of the supernatural cause from which they did proceed, namely, the diuel. Secondly, say you, *One cause may bring forth sundry effects, and one effect may proceed from sundry causes.* Doubtlesse happy might that man be, that cou'd apply either this One cause, or these sundry causes, to this cause we haue in hand. Is this your proposition. If one cause may bring forth sundry effects, and one effect proceede from sundrie causes, then the Actions or Passions reported by me in the Demoniakes, were not supernaturall: It is wonderfull what a man shal gaine by disputing with you. For now haue I learned by your priuiledged proposition. Not only these actions of our Demoniakes not to bee supernaturall, but also neither any action of any Demoniacke that either the Apostles, or Christ himselfe deliuered. Thirdly, *The like effects issue from diuers diseases.* I answer. If your skill in physicke be so great, tell vs. I beseech you, from what disease so many & strange effects might arise, as are witnessed to haue bene in these parties: & what disease it was they had? Whether had they the Lunacie, or the phrensie, or the Epilepsie, or the Mother, or it was some Convulsions, or Crampe that they had? Name the disease: And if so manie effects doe not proceede from one disease, as it is very likely, declare how manie diseases they had, and what they were. And whether they had all the diseases you men-

Dialog. Dis.  
204.



mention: their *swelling* arising from the *Mother*: their *foming* from the *Epilepsie*, their extraordinary strength from *mania*, &c. and so had a compounded disease, percase of as manie several diseases, as they had several effects. T<sup>e</sup>l vs also whether you haue seene one partie afflicted at the same time with *Melancholy*, *Lunacie*, *Phrensy*, *Epilepsy*, *Mother*, *Convulsion*, and the *Crampe*? Besides, whether you haue known such an one, diseased with all these grievous maladies, restored againe naturally to his health in one day? When you haue resolved these doubts, we wil hold our selues satisfied for this argument. In the meane season it remaines for all your answer, in as full force as euer it did. And here we may obserue, how all that they prattle both here and else where of *diseases* (whereby they woulde perwade, that the passions of the *Demoniaks* were not supernaturall, but might wel proceed from some natural disease) themselves do ouerthrow in affirming they are *Counterfeits*.

Again, I shewing that *the rayes and sooleries*, and blasphemous speeches uttered by the parties in their supernaturall passions, could not come immediately from God, and good Angels, and therefore no doubt from the diuell: You answer first, *They were not supernaturall effects*: but this is your Cuckow song, oft auouched, neuer proued with anie reason that might to much as beleeue *William Sommers*, one too renowned in his time. Secondly, that this supposed impossibilitie for either God, or good Angels to effect any such fantastickall, raine, and fleshy effects, is too grosse and absurd. Indeed you are the Maisters of absurdities, you may bestow one where you wil, as this is a notable one, and not to be named, that one should imagine the most Holy Lord, and his holy Angels should immediately, by themselves worke filthy effects. The blasphemies which arise from hence are not to bee remembered. There is neuer any filthinesse committed, but either by the filthinesse of our corrupt flesh, or by the working of vn-cleane spirits: farre be it from vs, we should once let it enter into our thoughts, that it did first issue, either from the fountaine, or from the streames of puritie. The Lord his iudgements are tied to a seemly manner of effecting, rightly vnderstood, which you denie: that is, that all his iudgements should bee effected by meanes best beleeving their nature: as iudgements of committing sinne are wrought by sinfull meanes, the Diuel, and wicked men, and such like, and not immediately by holy meanes: for this was to confound light and darkenesse, holinesse and sinne together. It is lamentable that anie carrying the name of Ministers amongst vs, should be so impiously

blind: and yet more lamentable, that they which will sit at the helme, wil suffer such impieties to be offered with their authoritie, to the world. Thirdly you answered, That these uncleane effectes do no more argue an uncleane spirit, then those holy effectes, as Confessing of Christ, and Expounding the Creed argue an holy spirit. As if you had cleane forgotten, The diuell can transforme himselfe into an Angell of light. If you had remembred this, and your old crosse-row, That there is no reasoning from contraries in common attributes, you would neuer have bewrayed such intolerable babishnesse. Lastly, say you, All this inferres no eall inherency, because the diuel can worke greater matters then these remaining without: concerning which, wee will see (God willing) in that which followeth.

Cor. 11.

4

Ag. 15. 16.

Job. 1. 7.

Mat. 12. 43

Pis. 5. 8.

Againe, whereas is vrged, the Diuels entring in, & going out of the partie possessed, you answered, All these speeches, and whatsoeuer text can possibly be alleaged throughout the whole Scriptures, concerning either Angels, or Spirits, or Diuels are to be taken metaphorically: and for this purpose you bring the diuels compassing the earth: his walking through drie places: and his roaring like a Lyon. As if because in these places there is some Metaphor, therefore all other must bee metaphorical too. Nay then let vs conclude, because these texts of Scripture be metaphorical, therefore all the Scripture is metaphorical, and not onely those mentioning Angels and Diuels. And so we shal reuiue the wickednesse of the Libertines, of the Family of Ioue, and of the Suenckesfeldians, acknowledging no literal sence of the Scripture, but a figuratiue meaning inspired into themselves, which only with them is the word of God. VVhen you disputed of the Serpent in Enahs tentation, you contended indeed The Serpent was onely meants figuratiuely, yet seemed after to reiect this opinion, and I liked well of it. But I crie you mercie: now I vnderstand you more fully. Wel then, the Angel Gabriel came to Marie, and brought tidings of her conceiuing the Sonne of God, was this done Metaphorically? Was there also no such thing literally done, as is reported the same Angel spake to Zachary, concerning Iohn the Baptist, whom hee should beget? Was that in figure too, that the Angels comforted our Saviour before his passion? Belike when the Diuel cast the child some time into the fire, sometimes into the water, there was no such matter indeed, but onely by way of Metaphor. And when the Diuel cried, VVhat haue I to do with thee O Iesus the Sonne of the most high God, this voice was Metaphoricall. Howsoeuer these and many like Scriptures are canonized by you to bee Metaphoricall, yet your selues without

Luc. 1. 30.

Luc. 1. 12.

Ec.

Luc. 21. 43.

Mat. 9. 22.

Mat. 5. 7.



# THE FIRST DIALOGVE.

9

*Metaphor*, are most properly a couple of the absurdest Dunces that euer put pen to paper. You goe on, and labour to ouerthrow the literall entring of the Diuell, because in *Marke* it is said, *There was a man in the Synagogue in an vnclane spirit*. If the words (say you) bee taken literally, then the man was essentially inherēt within the diuell. I answer, Neither are these wordes taken literally, neither for this cause is the entring of Satan, mentioned else where, to be vnderstood figuratiuely. The same thing may bee, and is vitered sometimes by figure, and sometimes by proper speech. One while our Sauour Christ calls himselfe *The way*, and *a Doore*: In another place he saith, *That they which beleue in him shall not perishe*, expounding in plaine tearmes that which is spoken by similitude else where. As for this Scripture, *To be in an vnclane spirit*, is not, as a thing cōtained in a thing containing, as water in a vessell, and such like, but to be in the power of an vnclane spirit, as our vulgar tongue expresseth fitly, when we say, Such an one is in a Feuer. *M. Beza*, in opening the meaning of this speech, vseth this selfe same example: and you your selues call it, *A very apt resemblance*. Seing therefore it fitzeth so wel, let me demaund of you, when we say, *A man is in a Feuer*, whether you thinke the feuer is within, or without him? You had thought to haue played you with this feuer, but it shaketh you a little better then you were aware of. For it plainly declareth, that the natural meaning of the wordes, notwithstanding they bee figuratiue, doth note vnto vs an inbeing of the spirit. But you adde out of Saint Luke: *There was a man in the Synagogue, which had a spirit of an vnclane diuell*. This translation, say you, is tolerable, if by the word *Spirit* we vnderstand not the simple essence, but onely the impulsio, motion, or inspiration of the spirit. I answer, we may. I graunt vnderstand by the word *Spirit*, an impulsio, motion, or inspiration, so wee doe not separate this Impulsio and motion from the reall presence of the Spirit. As when we talke of the vnderstanding of a man, wee know that vnderstanding is one thing, and the Man another, yet do not separate betweene the reall presence of these two, but ioine them together. And to this effect *Calvin* writeth on this place: *This speech* (saith he) *is as much as if Luke had said, This man was moued by the inspiration of the diuell: for by Gods permission Satan had possessed the powers of his soule, that he might enforce him at his pleasure, as wel to speake, as to other motions. And therefore when Demons speak, those very diuels, to whose rule they are permitted, both speake in them, & by them.* *Calvin* then graunts an *Inspiration*, but ioyned with the diuels

pag. 17. 1  
19.  
Mar. 1. 23.

pag. 20.  
Luc. 4. 33.

*uels presence*: These men make a diuorce betweene *Inspiration* and *presence*, as if these two could not abide within sight one of another. *The inspiration of the diuell is within, therefore his Essence is not*: which is as much to say, Because a mans braines be in his head, therefore his wit is in his heeles. But to let this passe, this onely I say to you, which by *Spirit* here vnderstand only the *motion, inspiration, or instigation of the spirit*, and affirme, it is grosse to vnderstand *Spirit Essential*: that by this your goodly exposition, this man mult bee diuorced of a *motion*, and not of a diuell.

pag. 21.

Further I alleadging, *The Diuell cannot possibly so moue the members of a man as he doth comonly of demoniakes being only without him, you oppose the captiuating of the wicked, his transporting of Christ, his disposing of the tongues of Shimei & Rabshakeh, his filling of Ananias his heart, and such like.* None of al which makes to any purpose. The members of demoniakes are in their supernaturall motions moued by the nerues, by the muscles, by the Tendons, the vsuall mouers of the body: and yet without commaund either of *Will*, or *Imagination*, these faculties at that instant being disabled to make choice of things according to their nature: yea sometimes there is a mouing in the body, without the seruice of the mouing instruments at all. But in the motions by you alleaged, there is no such matter. For in *Suggestions* the diuell by deceiuing the phantasie, and blinding the vnderstanding, preuaileth against the will, and this seduced commaundeth all the inierior parts, which he may performe outwardly. And as for transporting of bodies, here the whole body is caried violently, not by ordinarie stirring of those inward mouers appointed to this dutie, but at the pleasure of an outward cause, as when a man is caried in a ship, in a charret, on horsebacke, or after such other manner. By which it is apparant, the motions which be vsuall in *Demoniakes*, cannot be by outward suggestion, but only by inward operation, as disposing of the seuerall members of the body without the *Imagination* and *VWill*, sometimes by the instruments of motion, and sometimes (which is more strange) without. Moreover, I shewing some argument for his inherencie, from *his earnest desire to enter into the bodies of men, and to dwell there*: which appeareth by this, that he is vnwilling to be cast out: and being throwne out, findeth no rest till he recover his lost habitation: yea he rather desireth to enter into swine then to want a dwelling. You answere, *It is an idle conceit to dreame of such a desire: because, The Lord neuer granted him, nor bee euer desired any such thing,*

pag. 22.

Matth. 8. 3

&amp; 12. 43.

Mar. 5. 12.

# THE FIRST DIALOGVE.

11

thing against Iob, & yet no doubt he craved as much against him, & bad as much yielded, as ever against any, I reply: W<sup>h</sup>ilest we are disputing of the qualitie of the Duels vexation, you tel vs a tale of the qualitie. We are not now weighing whether Iob or Demoniaks are more grievously afflicted, but whether they bee molested after the same maner. Albeit this is great ignorance in you, to think the torments of the body to proceed frō greater tyranny, then his malice that he powreth vpon the soule. Was not his power greater in Iudas, though no Demoniake, thē in the man, whom he had possessed a long time? But to returne to Iob: we neuer heard till this day that hee was a Demoniake: and by your rule, if Iob was not one (as his booke shewes he was not) there was neuer anie: because as much power was graunted against him, as against any, and so all those Demoniaks mentioned in the Gospel, by your reckening shall proue but tales. Let the same answere suffice you for *Abahi prophecs*, vntill wee may heare you are either of a better minde, or of more learning. That which you dispute of *Saul being possessed*, is an idle excursion of your owne. I no where maintaine it, I et where you contend that there were no possessions at all in Iſrael, till a little before the coming of Christ, one might iustly demaund of you, which professe so greates insight in this matter, how the Iewes became so cunning to iudge of their possessed? And why *Eleazarus* in the dayes of *Vespasian* & *Iosephus*, boasted of *Salomons Exorcismes*? I doubt not but it was most false to attribute any such wickednes to that wise king: yet these men being but a little after our Sauibour Christ, might haue beene convicted by the testimonie of many liuing, but especially by their owne histories, if they should haue fathered such practises vpon *Saloman*, which had beene euident did begin but yesterday. It seemeth then by opinion of those ancient Iewes, that Possessions & Dispossessions were before *Salomons* time, otherwile they would not haue made him an author of a thing that sprung vp after him. But you will proue by argument, that none were possst till a little before the coming of Christ. The first of your reasons are contained in these words: Thus, then it is euident that *Saul* was neuer possst, and so consequently, that (till a little before the coming of Christ) there were no possessions at all in Iſrael. This argument I answere by the like. It is euident that *Saul* had not the Leprosie. Ergo, there were no Lepers in Iſrael, till a little before the coming of Christ. The other reason you render hereof is, because this iudgement is not foretold & threatened the Iewes by some of the Prophecs at least. As though euerie

Mar. 5. 3. &c

Page. 29. 30.

\*whiles hee was king.

# REPLIE TO

indement of God were specified by some of the Prophets. But I will leave you to sport a while with *Sanders* also with that of the *British* *serpent*, which is a deale of your owne in this matter, nothing pertainig to me.

ag. 31.

Concerning supernaturall effects in *Sommers*, as that *hauling* *pinx* *thrust* very deepe into his leg, and other parts of his body without sense, or feeling thereof. *Physiologus* answers, that *Sommers* hath since deposed, be-  
ag. 34. &c. fide the pinnes, but dissembled the paines. I answer, his deposition no doubt is a thing much to be regarded, as he hath sold himselfe to be at the Bishop's pleasure, whereby there was nothing so apparant-ly false, which he would not dare to affirm, or deny, as hee percei-  
ed his liking. But *Physiologus* tels vs further out of *Calen*, that the *remission* *force* beinge awfully employed in some manner, the onward *firm* *stirring* *was* *thus* *by* *your* *selfe* *whereby* *Sommers* *in* *like* *manner* *might* *be* *scattered* *then*, as *Physiologus* is now. But to waken him a little, I would he would trye the pinnes himselfe. No doubt his owne meditations beinge farre more serious and weightie, then could bee in that paltrie boy, he should receive no paine at al: of which if we were once assured by his experience, then were we through for this point. For his *foining*, *Physiologus* answers, that parties affected with the *Epilepsie*, *foame*, and that *Scotch* *do* *framed*: vnto which adde these two Answers: That *foame* out also their owne shame. Concerning their violent motions and stirrings, ext ordinary strength, or knowledge, you obiect nothing, but what *M. Harpur* hath done before: vnto whom I haue answered. It had bene more becomming to haue supplied to that, then thus to roll ouer the same stone againe. You call for *Knapping* *of* *iron* *chains*: *vsunder*, and then you would be come: as if the Lord must giue power to Satan to feede our vaine humours. But you remember who promised to beleue too, if their curious desires might haue bene: satisfied, who euen scorned the present workes: they saw, and still desired greater, but obtained not. If there had bene *chaines* broken, *M. Harpur* would haue charged the Smith with confederacie, and would haue required they had bene so fastened, as the *Keeper* *of* *Nemgate* could haue fastened them. And yet suppose he had fastened them, it would haue bene said hee had combined with vs. If this could be cleared, then *Darrell* should haue bewitched him, or *Sommers* himselfe should be a witch. If this would not serue, yet some by argument would maintaine, that none can be possessed in these dayes: nay, that there were neuer any possessed. So be the matter neuer so true and impossible to be counter-  
feited

ag. 36.

Discovery  
pag. 29.

## THE FIRST DIALOGVE.

13

feited, some thing would ever be excepted, as long as wee have to deale with men Lords over their owne tongues, and have no Lord on earth to controll them. Considering then I have to meddle with men of this kind, who, so they presaying something, spare not to say any thing, bee it never so false, vncredible, and absurd, it shall be folly in me to spend words about them.

You affirme: *The Deponents themselves haue since more aduisedly reformed their oaths, and opposed the contrary.* I answer: They haue done nothing lesse. Nay, these reexaminations make more for the confirming, then weakening of that they formerly deposed. And this I haue made euident in my former answer to the Chapter of *Reexamination*, where *Mr. Harsnet* objecteth the very same you do here. pag. 41.

VVhereunto you should haue returned a reply, or else for shame neuer mentioned that, which is already answered. But you may bee ashamed (if you be not past all shame) to say, that they reexamined deposed thus: namely, that now by their better enlightened iudgements, they plainly perceiue all those the former supposed supernaturall actions or passions, to be but mere counterfeited toys, and plaine cōsoning or actiſes. O palpable slander! What wil you sticke to affirme, who spare not to publish this for truth? I refer thee, good Reader, to my *Deduction* the place before quoted, where thou shalt see this to be most vntrue. Deduct lib. 5. cap. 8.

Whereas, I say, they would haue punished the witnesses, if those things had bene found counterfeited: you answer, as if they were dismissed vpon compassion, being silly poore persons: and yet of about thirtie that haue testified the things vnpossible to be counterfeited, vpon their corporall oathes, fewer of them be preachers. pag. 42.

After you come to the *signes of Possession*, which you denie to bee set downe as rules to discerne *Essentiall Possessions* by. They be rules of such possessions as were in the Scriptures: and wee haue shewed them to be *Essentiall*, whatsoever yet you either haue, or can prate to the contrarie. How foolish and beggarly the words be, you further multiply to this end, I haue manifested in your Discourses, I need not repeate them. For the number of signes I stand not strictly vpon them. Where they are all, I say there is a Possession: I doe not say, where there be fewer, or diuers others, there is no Possession. For this is free to the Lord to afflict in what measure it pleaseth him. Neither do I crosse my selfe, as you vntruly charge me, making the Scripture signes the only meanes to discerne of Possessions: and then in the 16. & 17. pag. euery way equal my experimented signes with any of them. I onely in the pages mentioned name some fewe super- pag. 43. &c.

natural

naturall effects, which in experience I haue obserued in Demoniacs. But in what place I set them, and how I account of them, is euident in the 37. page, where speaking of experimented signes, I vſe theſe words: *But ſb: Scripture making no mention of theſe ſignes, they are to be regarded accordingly.* And ſo likewiſe in the 22. page. In the applicaion of the ſignes, you impute vnto me diuers contrarieties after your lying and ſlaunderous manner. As if I ſhould ſay: *Som: times they haue ſupernaturall ſtrength and knowledge, yet ſometimes againe, they onely ſeeme to haue. Sometime Satan hurtes, but hurtes not indeed, &c.* Touching the firſt of theſe, I hauing ſpoken of the ſupernaturall ſtrength and knowledge of the parties controuerted, in the concluſion thereof ſhew, that I am not ſo to be miſunderſtood, as though I meant that they had ſupernaturall ſtrength and knowledge: but therefore is this aſcribed vnto them by mee, becauſe they ſeeme to haue ſuch knowledge and ſtrength. And thus oft in ſcripture is that attributed to Demoniacs, which was indeed performed by the diuell, and done onely by them in a ſeeming ſhew. So the Demoniacke, *Mark 5.* is ſaid to *breake chaines and fetters aſunder*, whereas not he, but the diuell brake them. And this is one of your worthy contradictions. Concerning the latter, I ſay thus, that *Howſoever they are ſo miſerably vexed by Satan, as the beholders would iudge them in moſt extreme and intollerable paines, yet they feele no paines at all.* Yet I doubt not but that Satan can ſo order the matter, as that the Poſſeſſ'd ſhall haue paine, when he ſhall ſee it ſerue for his purpoſe, &c. By which I ſhewe there is not one vniſorme order to be expected in theſe caſes: which variety of affliction, theſe men would draw to inſtancie of opinion. You condemne me alſo for thinking, *The Scripture ſignes are not recorded onely as matter of fact, but partly to helpe vs in diſcerning of poſſeſſions.* I ground my reaſon on the queſtion of our Sauour: *How long time is it he hath becme thus?* You anſwere, *Chriſt reſpecteth in this queſtion onely the firſt time of that accident.* And I reply, you reſpect in this anſwer how to triſſe off any thing objected againſt you, with fooliſh words without any ſubſtance at all. Doth not our Sauour loyne together with the time, the maner and forme of his handling? Doth he not enquire as well of the one, as of the other? We muſt haue a queſtion of time without any ſubieſt matter, or reference to any thing. Miraculous Anſwerers, which can meaſure time without any ſtandard laid vnto it! You charge me with *ſoſtling in words into the text* for aduantage: but it is your owne mouthes which runne ouer with the word *Effentially*, and not any addition of mine. I con-

tent

p. 46.

p. 47.  
p. 17.

p. 48:

p. 49: 1

p. 49:



## THE FIRST DIALOGVE.

rent my selfe with the phraſe of the holy Ghoſt, reiecting theſe rearmes as needleſſe and ſuperfluous. Though whereſoeuer the diuel is, this ſpeech properly vnderſtood (as it is vſually in the matter of Poſſeſſion) there muſt alſo his ſpiritual eſſence be. I hat which you thinke is more then the text, is onely added to paraphraſe it: and though theſe words *In him*, be not in this Scripture, yet are they elſe where vſed in like caſe: you are very hungry, which would leap at ſo ſmall a morſell. Act. 19.

Whether there be a medicine or no for curing Eſſentiall poſſiſion, you ſay, we ſhall ſee after in handling that point, and I am content to refer it thither. As for Speedie deliuerance of the afflicted, I acknowledge it is no argument of poſſeſſion: and I thanke you for reprouing it, though of my ſelte I would be ready to retract anie thing diſſonant from the truth. It is not my deſire, any my ſtubble ſhould bee layd vpon the foundation, but I am cōtent the fire of Gods word ſhould conſume it. pag. 50. 51

I alleaging thoſe words of the law, *That the Lord will bring vpon tranſgreſſors euery ſickeſſe, and euery plague which is not written in the booke of the Law, untill they be deſtroyed*: And alſo that of Saint Iohn: *He that ſhall adde vnto theſe things, God ſhall adde vnto him the plagues that are written in this booke*, to proue that men may now be poſſeſſed: you anſwere, *I abuſe the Scripture, making Poſſeſſion ſometimes written, ſometimes vnrwritten*. But you abuſe your ſelues, and your Reader to iangle about that, which euery child might teach you. For who knowes not that ſome things might bee vnrwritten in the Law, that be very frequent in the Goſpel, as indeed Poſſeſſion is? But to anſwer my argument out of theſe places, you denie Eſſentiall poſſiſion to be decreed in God his eternall counſell for a iudgement. That Poſſeſſion is eſſentiall, we haue ſufficiently proued in ſuruey of your *Diſcourſes*. I hat it is decreed for a iudgement, may appeare to any not wilfully blind, by thoſe manifold examples of men poſſeſſed in the Scriptures: Except thoſe things hapned beſide the decree of God, or elſe thoſe poſſeſſions were rewards and beneſits, not iudgements and afflictions. It may be your impudent vaine will not ſticke to admit either: though none can avouch the firſt but Atheiſts, nor the ſecond but only men that are mad. I haue ſhewed in your *Diſcourſes*, how the Lords iudgements are perpetual, though not inflicted euery moment, but after ſuch intermiſſion as pleaſeth him. Is it not then excellent ſtuffe you bring, *That the iudgements of this liſe* (for we ſpeake only of them) *cannot perpetually* pag. 54.

bet inflicted, but saluation must needs be barred from all in Christ? In like maner, because I say, Possession is but a condition, all and temporall iudgement, you therefore interre, It is not perpetuall. Where you play with the word, meaning by perpetuall, a continued connexion, such as nothing may be put betweene, when as that is vsually said to bee perpetuall, which is common to all ages, though it appeare but now and then. You charge me with disputing from *May be*, to a *being in deed*. May not I wel dispute. *It may be*, whe you would euerie where maintaine *It cannot bee*? How can a being indeede bee concluded, before it be manifest the same thing *May be*? If the heauens therefore fall, we shall not onely catch Larks, as you say, but by catching also of you two, we shall catch something that wants braines.

I affirming, *There is as great cause of this iudgement now, as at any time heretofore*: you answer, *It is vtrly untrue*: The manifestation of Christs Deitie, and the confirmation of his glorious Gospel being the maine causes of possession in Christs time. My meaning is as appeareth by my words, there is as great cause in respect of sin, as much abounding now as euer. For I do not compare this cause of punishment, with the manifestation of Christ his Deitie. And therefore besides the ceasing of the two maine causes, you should also haue shewed that sin was ceased, or else sinne to be no cause: which you purpose to doe in the pages following. But in the meane season, how doe you flourish it, as if I should proudly limit the Lord his times and seasons for inflicting his iudgements? I limit no times, but leaue it free to the Lord: yet knowing the reward of sinne, and the ample kingdom it now hath, according to the maner of all the Prophets, I can do no lesse then expect his fearefull iudgements of what kind so euer. But you will proue Possession is no punishment for sinne, and that out of the Depth of Diuinity. Your reason is, Afflictions of this life, laid vpon the Elect, be not properly punishments. It is true: but what do you lay to this? possession of Diuels is an affliction of this life. We graunt this too: yet so, that not onely Possession is an affliction of this life, but that there be infinite other miseries and calamities besides. What then? Shall we now conclude, That no miserie or calamitie whatsoeuer, as well as this of Possession, is any punishment for sinne? O deepe Diuinitie, and such as hath not beene raised from the bottomlesse pit till now! I denie not but the Lord may impose it vpon a man for trial, and for other ends, as he knowes best, but may he not also therfore inflict it as a chastisement for sinne, or castigatorie punishment? But your assumption containeth more in it, v<sup>z</sup>. that Possession is an affliction

pg. 55.

pg. 56.

pg. 57. 58.



# THE FIRST DIALOGVE.

17

*tion of this life laid vpon the elect.* This also I confesse is true : but it will not aduantage you, except ye adde, that it is *laid onely vpon the elect*, and then shall we haue Possession a note of our election, and so a blessed thing to be posselt with diuels, which is such diuinitie, as neuer Diuine, deepe or shallow, once dreamed of. It is a shame to rehearse your fooleries. Then you will vrge it more strongly, for that our *Sauour curing the possessed hath giuen them no watchword of sinning no more.* This watchword was giuen but in one cure, as I remember *Was* all other diseases therefore no chastisements for sin ? Whether our Sauour speake, or whether be silent, you are men that can take occasion for your absurdities vpon either. I will not waste paper with rehearing more of this stuffe. Consider with your selues that lesser afflictions be punishments for sinne, as we speake vulgarly, if your profunditie will giue vs leaue : That all death is the stipend of sinne, and that Possession is a kind of death. Besides, Offenders are deliuered to Satan by the Church, not for reward, but for Chastisement. And if to bee in the power of Satan howsoeuer, bee a chastisement, what is it to be in his possession ? Is not he the Executioner appointed ouer the wicked ? Hath not hee the power of death ? How can any one be in his hands, and bee not in death ? Or how in death, and not in punishment ? Our Sauour teacheth that Repossession hapneth vpon negligence and securitie, whereby it may bee apparant, that the first possession is not for a mans vertues. It is needlesse to vse many prooffes in a plaine case, if I had not to deale with men to whom Sunshine is darkenesse.

*Iob. 5. 14.*

*Leuit. 26. 18.*

*Deut. 28. 2.*

*Rom. 6. 23*

*Ephes. 2. 12*

*1. Cor. 5. 5.*

*Heb. 2. 14*

*1. 2. 44*

The testimonies of the *Doctrs*, which I alleage in the *Margine*, you blame, for that they be not fully set downe. You haue examined them in your *Discourses*, and confesse they speake as I report them. I omitted in this place to put downe their wordes, being after to vse them in prooffe of Dispossession by prayer and fasting since miracles ceased, which position you see includes the former, and to what purpose should I clogge the Reader with vnnessearie repetition ? Nay what should I be burdensome to you ? For in that place where they do speake, they speake so plainly, as you could wish their tongues were out, as we shal see in the next dialogue. If you would discredit *VVierus*, reporting *seuentic damfels in Rome possessed with spirits in one night*, it had beene meet you should haue done it with some probabilitie : it is not ynough, for that it was at *Rome*. Will you credit nothing done in that kingdome ? No maruell, you will not credit things done at home, though neuer so substantially cer-

*pag. 59.*

*Dialog. Disc.*  
*pag. 171.*

taine,

anno 1566

pag. 60.

pag. 62.

pag. 62. 63.

taine. It is likely, if it had bene but a pra'tise of *Romane Exorcists*, they would haue dispatched it in lesse then *two yeares*. None of the was recoulered within this time. To haue so many possessed, and for so long time, and not one of them to be dispossessed, made little for the credit of the Exorcists, and of the Popish Church, if Dispossession be a marke of the true Church, as the Papists teach. And so of the *thirtie children possessed at Amsterdam*, the same yeare they broke downe their images, and reformed the Religion, as if the Diuell the more raged, considering his short time there, as he v'sually doth at his farewell. *Thy* report may be allowed at least, in thinges that are witnessed by others. Neither did *D. Fulke* not inueigh against Possession, because it had no maintainers in his time, but because it was gainesaid by none. *M. Foxe, M. Laie, M. Robinson*, with sundry other Diuines liuing in *D. Fulke*'s time, were of opinion there were possessions, as appeared by their pra'tise, and some of their writings. But what neede I any should with earnestnes defend that, which no man of a ly reckening opp'aigne? This controuersie is new sprung vp, first hatche'd, and brought into light by enuie, and still nourished by flatterie and Ambition, and expectation to get something from his good Lordship. For your argument from *Miracles*, I hope I haue quashed in your reath'd Dialogue. Is it not wonderfull that you acknowledg'ng *Pyssion* to be a *supernaturall* disease; and a thing hidden in the secret counsel of Gods execute and effect: when a id where he will, and therefore may neuer by any man liuing be auouched for certain, that you dare so presumptuously conclude, that now there can be no *Pyssion*? If it be so secret as y<sup>e</sup> say, it is no lesse daunger for you to denie it, then for me to affirme it. But you are like the prudent topper of trees, that stnkes in sunder the verie bough hee stands on.

For prayer and fasting how it is a meanes to expell Satan, wee shall see more, God willing in the next Dialogue, if any thing bee needfull to be added to that already spoken. Whereas I put a difference between the curing of possessions now, & those done by the Apostles for that now it is done by an *intreating word*, then by a *bare commanding word*, you answer, as befeemeth your abur'd fashion, that *Miraculous curing of possessions in Christs time was at no hand effected by a bare commanding word. but by a supernaturall power concurring therewith*. O deepe Clerks, and men that haue diuied to the verie bottome of Diuinitie! VVhen we make comparison of meanes vsed by men, what haue we to doe with *supernaturall power*? Doth either

eyther the *intreating word* or *Commanding word* exclude that? pag. 64.  
 Would any men in their wits denie the work of the instrument, be- Matt. 8. 16.  
 cause it is moued by the principall cause? Meate doth not nourish,  
 because the Lord giueth strength, & the Masse to bread: Faith is not  
 by hearing, because it is the gift of God. Such are the demonstra-  
 tions wherewith these *Discowrs* think they haue put all the world  
 to silence: which happily they haue done, except it be for laughing.  
 I do no where affirme that Possession is a *naturall disease*, and there-  
 fore do not goe about by *Matth. 4. 24.* and *Luke 8. 21.* to proue it, Luc. 8. 21.  
 because in those places it is iointly recorded with *naturall diseases*, 17.  
 wherewith you charge me, and by diuerse arguments verie soberly  
 confute me: but saying that Possession with *Diuels* is in the Gospel oft  
 brought in among other plagues of God, for prooofe thereof, I doe pro-  
 duce the aforesaid Scriptures. Indeed I say, that Possession is a *disease*,  
 but adde, to wit, *supernaturall*: and a little after call it an *unnaturall*  
*disease*: Vnderby I make it plaine, what manner of disease I ac-  
 count it to be. If you would now haue confuted me, you should  
 haue bent your force against these things I say, and not against that  
 I no where do affirme. But this is with you an vsuall thing: You  
 adde, that I *deeming possession to be but a merre naturall maladie*, doe  
 directly crosse my former speech, where I make it a *supernaturall mala-*  
*die*. And this forsooth is one of your Contradictions. But you must  
 first proue better then you haue done yet, that I doe not onely  
*deeme*, but say, that Possession is a *naturall maladie*, before it be so in-  
 deed that I crosse mine owne speech. If I were giuen as much to crosse  
 my body, as you say I am to crosse my selfe in my speech, I were a ve-  
 ry fit man to make a Papist, who loue of life to crosse themselves. To  
 make vp your summie, you foist vs in a counterfeit: That all *super-* pag. 65.  
*naturall works* are *miracles*, as if faith, hope, and charitie, peace of con-  
 science, and such like were all miracles: which if it be true, we must  
 needs stil haue miracles, or els haue no Church. The Papists would  
 be glad to heare of these tidings, but no body else, except such as  
 would reioice at your folly. For your *second, third, fourth, and fift*  
*Dialogues*, wherein, you thinke, you haue ouerthrowne *Essentiall posses-*  
*sion*, by that time you haue weighed in a iust ballance, what hath  
 bene answered thereunto, you shall perceiue to haue preuailed as  
 much, as if you had laboured to overthrow your Peake hills. You pag. 66. 67.  
 say, *You haue beword Possession is not inflicted for sinne*, but I say, you  
 must shew it better, before any man of wildome can beleue you.  
 I haue branded your absurditie in your *Discourses*, or that you can

Iob. 12. 31.

Genf. 9. 14.

35.

pag. 68.

\* pag. 67.

pag. 69.

clude a small end of possession from the casting forth of the prince of this world. Here you increate it a thousand fold in making your owne singular, foolish, and impious wresting of this Scripture, to contain a matter of no lesse certaintie, then is the expresse word of God, for an utter end of any the like floud to that, which was in Noahs time. I do not tie the Lord to the punishment of Gomorrah, or of the children deriding the prophet, or of Gehazi, and such others: but where the like sinnes raigne, there may be the like punishment, which you will not grant in a tuall Possession, hauing put a necessarie end vnto it. But you will not be pressed with *May be*. Much a do you keep with this Sophisme, a *possidasse*. Wherefoever you meet with *may or can* in the conclusion, then estoones you tell vs of this fallacie. As in your Discourses your skil in Rhetorike, & in discerning of Tropes did faile you: so here it doth in Logicke, & in discerning Elenchs. To auouch Possession of duels to be insisted also for sinne is Cucklike, melodie in your eares, but you haue sung vs a Iacke Dawes song in limiting it with *\*two onely ends*, that is, of confirmation of Christs Deity, and of the Gospell, as I haue abundantly proued.

Whereas I affirme the iudgement of our senses for the truth of Sommers vexation by Satan, you reply, *Our senses could not comprehend such supernaturall matters: besides, they might be deluded, and duels can do things in shew*. For comprehension, seeing you depriae vs of all iudgement of sense, blame vs not if we be something dull in conceiuing this. How that seeing, we do not see: feeling, we do not feele: smelling, we do not smell: and hearing, wee doe not heare: and that we require you would make it plaine vnto vs. Which when you haue once done, and beaten into our heads, I will neuer trust mine eyes againe, though I should see M. Deacon in forme of an Angel of light. But if our senses were deluded, & things done in shew, that were not in deed, surely it was Satan that deluded vs. and no counterfeiting in Sommers, as you would faine haue it. This is the summe of your first dialogue against me, to which Lycanthropus subscribeth as able to suffice any reasonable man: but this, is but a small thing, saith Pneumatomachus, and therefore he stretcheth the matter to an higher pitch, That neither any unreasonable man (which is much more) shall be euer able to answer it. So that now we are much beholding to M. Deacon, and M. Walker, that haue put all fooles and mad men to a perpetuall *non plus*, whose tongues would otherwise continually bee ramping.

Concerning the strange and present affliction of the boy of Northwich,

# THE FIRST DIALOGVE.

21

Northwich, I will say nothing: I neuer sawe him: howsoever you  
desant on the matter after your lying & paltry maner. Yet I think  
it not amisse to offer to thy view (good Reader) the iudgement of  
the Bishop of Chester in his direction to his parents, and of three  
other Commissioners for causes Ecclesiasticall, according with him  
therein.

pag. 71.

**F**irst we thinke it fit, and doe require the parents of the said childe, that  
they suffer not any to repaire to their house to visite him. saving such  
as are in authority, and other persons of speciall regard and knowne dis-  
cretion, and to haue speciall care that the number alwayes be very smal.  
Further hauing seene the bodily affliction of the said child, and observed  
in sundry fits & vnystrange effects and operations, either proceeding of na-  
tural or unknowne causes, or of some diabolical practise: we thinke it conue-  
nient and fit for the ease and deliuerance of the said childe from his grie-  
uous afflictions, that prayer be made for him publicly by the minister  
of the parish, or any other preacher repairing thither, before the congrega-  
tion so oft as the same assembleth. And that certaine preachers, namely,  
M. Garrad, M. Mafsey, M. Collier, M. Haruey, M. Eaton, M. Pierston  
and M. Brownhill, these onely and none other to repaire vnto the saide  
childe by twintes, as their leisuers will serue, and to vse their discretions by  
primate prayer and fasting, for the ease and comfort of the afflicted: with  
all requiring them to abstaine from all solemne meetings, because the ca-  
lamitie is particular, and the authoritie of the allowing and prescribing  
such meetings resteth neither in them nor in vs, but in our Superiours,  
whose pleasure it is fit we should expect. Moreover, because it is by some  
beld that the childe is really possessed of an vniuersall spirit, for that there  
appeareth to vs no certaintie, nor yet any great probability thereof, wee  
thinke it also conuenient, and require the preachers aforesaid to forbear  
all formes of Exorcisme, which alwayes imply and presuppose a reall and  
actuell possession.

Rich. Costriensis.  
David Tale. Chancel.  
Griff. Vaughan.  
Hugh Burges.

Hereunto I will adde a fewe lines, which M. Haruey aforesaid, a  
man of great learning and godlines, writ in his life time to a friend  
of his.

Grace & mercie from our only Sauior. There is such a boy as your report  
signifieth,

signifieth, whose estate from the beginning of February till this present, hath bene so strange and extraordinary in regard of his passions, behaviour, and speeches, as I for my part neuer heard, nor read of the like. Few that haue seene the variety of his fits, but they thinke the diuell hath the disposing of his body. My selfe haue diuers times seene him, and such things in him as are impossible to proceed from any humane creature. The matter hath affected our whole country. The Diuines with vs generally hold, that the child is really possessed. And so much for him.

pag. 76.

Rom. 12. 15.

Wee see what the Bishop and Preachers of Chesse-shire their iudgement is touching this child. What say nowe the Discourers concerning him? They after they haue for three leaues together scotted at his grievous affliction (for so the Bishop before tearmeth it) in most prophane, chikdish, and scurrulous maner, doe in the end affirme, that he counterfeitheth, and that this would loone appeare, if he were well coniuued a while with a three corded whip. Is this the fruit of your visiting the child? you had better haue kept you at home. Was this all the comfort the distressed boy and parents received from you? Miserable comforters then are you. Is this the mercy, and all the bowels of compalsion that is in you, towards him that is in miserie? O mercilesse men, and voyd of all pitie! It appeareth you haue not learned to weepe, with them that weepe. Well, I can tell you of a couple of such merrie or mercilesse companions as your selves, that comming of late to one M. James Charles of Wolroych in Kent, to see his daughter Clemens Charles, who is reputed to be possessed with the diuell, &c. not without cause. they scarce went so merri-ly home, as they were at M. Charles, and yet but a small thing befell them by the way. Returning home, they went by one M. Hooke his house of Darlton, maister not long before to this maid, at whose house she began to bee afflicted. Now as they were on horsebacke before M. Hooke his doore, and sporting themselues with him about the counterfeiting of this new vpstart counterfeit: behold, one of their horses staled bloud, and as they were talking thereof, loe. the other did the like: whereat they were somewhat appaull'd. How it fared with their horses after I know not, but the day following they caried themselues at M. Charles more soberly, whether they went on other horses. But hereof ynough: I will nowe proceede to your second Dialogue.

A



A REPLIE TO THE  
SECOND DIALOGVE,

THE second part of my Doctrine treateth, That those eight before mentioned were verily dispossessed, & that by fasting and prayer, the meanes appointed by God. For confirmation wherof, I knew no better rule then the example of men dispossessed in holy Scripture, which is the onely true and vnfallible touchstone to examine both this, and all other actions by. These *Answers* scorne these notes, calling them *falsly pretended signes of dispoſſeſſion from sacred Scripture*, and therefore pretermittin<sup>g</sup> them, require my argumentes, as if the Signes from Scripture were no arguments at all. It seemeth you haue found a veine of better mettall then the Scriptures, fro whence your whole booke is so full stuffed with your owne shining drossle, and is so vtterly destitute of this purified gold. Yet you cannot beat me from them, but I vrge them thus: *There were in our Demoniakes the selfe same signes or notes of dispoſſeſſion, precedent and subsequent, which wee reade of in the Scripture Demoniakes, and therefore the same dispoſſeſſion* you answer, *There were not the same signes in our demoniakes: and first, because they were meere cosonages, as is confessed freely by the parties themselves upon their owne oathes.* I reply, the parties we speake of, bee eight in number, whereof onely *Sommers* hath made this cursed confession: which was not free and voluntarie, as you vntruely affirme, but extorted by Satan, and his instruments, as in my *Detestation* I haue made manifest. But what say you to the seuen in *Lancashire*? It may be *Sommers* hath sworne for the all: for they as yet, were neuer examined: yet because we doubt of *Sommers* general oath, I pray you proue vnto vs, who taught the children to counterfeit? when, and where, and by what meanes they were taught? what end might induce them to imbrace such teaching? whether the parents were pruy to it? and what they propounded in practising such wickednesse? Yea, put *Sommers* too into the roll, & shew vs what man is able by practise to do the things that either *Sommers* or they did? And one woulde thinke a man of meane agility might quickly performe that, which colouring yong boyes and girles could. Shew vs, I beseech you, these and such like things, or otherwise if you cannot shew the, & yet tel vs of *cosnage*, you shew vs nothing but your long eares, & braſen faces. Secondly,

pag. 82.

Detest. pag.  
127.

## REPLIE TO

act. pag. 37

say you. *The signes in the Scripture Demoniakes were sensibly perceived by the beholders: but these in your pretended Demoniakes were not so, by your own confession.* Belike all we that were spectators of our Demoniakes, being (at sundrie times) a great multitude, were all stricken with blindness, with deafnesse, and with a benumbednes, and yet we all thought we used our senses, and I am sure, wee were no sooner out of the place, but we were able, the Lord bee thanked, to see, heare, and feele. But you confirme this by *mine own confession*, which saith, that *the spirit could not possibly be felt or seene.* I said so, & say so againe, that Spirits cannot be felt or seene in their owne bare essence, but as they make themselves knowne vnto vs by their effects. Iangling Sophisters will dispute, That the nose of a mans face cannot be seene, because that which we see is but colour or forme, and the nose it selfe is neither of both. Your eares ring it may bee with their noise, which hath made you borrow an argument from them. Thirdly, you say, *The Signes we report are false: which I would graunt you, if your selues had learned to speake truth.* We must remember there are about two hundred witnesses hereof living at this day, of which some haue deposed the same wee report of *Somerset.* Fourthly, say you, *Scripture Signes can argue no Dispossession now, because like effects may arise from naturall causes, and from all diseases.* By this your good helpe Atheists might ouerthrow all Possessions and Dispossessions in the Scripture. But howsoever you may be friendly to such vile wretches, yet haue they no foothold from hence. For neither those effects in those ancient Demoniakes, nor in these of our time jointly & wholly considered can proceed from naturall disease. Naturall causes can bring forth no supernaturall effects, as we haue demonstrated these to be in spight of your seventh Dialogue, and what other treaty soeuer you oppose against it. Lastly, say you, *A dispossession may bee without such apparant signes, and therefore your signes precedent and subsequent do not necessarily conclude a dispossession.* What? Because it is sometimes without these signes, therefore where these signes are shall it not be? It is sometime day light without the cleare sunshine, therefore when the Sunne shines cleare shall it not be day? Sometimes the murderer slayes a man and is not taken with the manner, therefore if he be taken with the manner, shall he not necessarily bee concluded a murtherer? These are good rules to make a man impudent in sinne: for by them the bold offender shall speede better, then hee that doth it mincingly, You haue spoken then pretily against these signes, but without any  
signe



signe of truth or wit.

From Scripture signes I descend to some experimented by my selfe in dealing with Demoniakes, which have reported certaine visible shapes, in which the diuels seemed to depart from them. But here I am taken vp for halting, in that I call it *my experience*, which *was proued in the persons of other*. I confesse I spake rudely, as all other men do, which call a phyitian a man of good experience, though he hath not proued all the diseases, he hath dealt with, in his owne body. As for visible shapes, you *intirely deny*, that Spirits could proue the: yet they did before Pharaoh, and infinite others since, as wee haue shewed by better arguments in my suruey of your fourth and fift Dialogues, then you euer haue, or can for the contrarie. Some also I shew did vomit, or straine to vomit when the diuel departed, *with* pag. 84.  
this you make good sport, perhaps tickled with remembrance, that you haue returned to your owne vomit.

Further, I concluding a dispossession, from the present effect of our prayers (whereof the like is not in naturall diseases.) You charge me with *proper tearmes*, as with certaine charming words to confound the Lord with, for so it pleaseh your prophane mouthes to speake. And yet I do not vs the word *proper*. Onely I say: *And God heard our prayer uttered in such tearmes*, that is, made to that effect, as before I haue shewed in briebe. I neuer dreamed that such Argooes would come after mee with so manie eyes, to finde an hole in my coate for these words more the in all other mens. But to let words passe, you would disproue the effect of our prayers, for that we could not make the parties *the Temples of the holy Ghost*, as we had prayed. *Wee* pag. 86.  
challenge no such power, but we might well hope of the mercy of the Lord to sanctifie them, which did plainly behold his great goodnesse in deliuering them from Satans great rage. Howsoeuer mee thinks you should not be offended with vs for putting vp this request to God. And what if the Lord doth not alwayes yeelde present successe to the prayers of his seruants? Could we not therefore be assured he had now heard vs, when we saw the thing performed before our eyes? It is true the Diuel sometime seemeth to depart, when he doth not, but when it is at the requests of Gods people: when it is after such grievous vexation as was in the Demoniakes in the Gospell, when it is with the health of the parties, and present free come from all former vexations dy Satan, wee need not doubt of it in any sort. For the visible departure of Satan, I answered you euen very now.

Esides,

Isg. 87. 88.

89.

Matt. 12. 43

Matt. 12. 45

Besides, I aileage for Dispossession, *Satan desire of repossessio*, which is neuer but after he is throwne out. You returne a double answer, first, that these wordes, I will returne to the house from whence I came, &c. be metaphoricall. Wee remember indeede your monstrous absurditie in making all things whatsoeuer spoken of Angels, and diuels in the scripture, to be Metaphoricall. But as I haue shewed you, manie are not Metaphoricall, so neither is this repeating the sentence of it. The words be part of a similitude, as is plaine by the reddition, *So shall it be to this wicked generation*. The whole standeth thus. As when an vncleane spirit goeth forth of a man, passeth through drie places seeking rest, and findeth none: then saith, I will returne to my house, &c. entring againe in, the last estate of that man is worse then the first: so shal it be to this wicked generatiō. Now to find what part of this sentence is Metaphoricall, we are to know that a similitude is twofold. One which is contracted & shut vp in one word, properly called a Metaphor: the other dispaied & spread open, consisting of all the parts at large; and is termed by the name of the generall, a Similitude. For the figuratiue part in either, the reason is one in both. Therefore as in a contracted similitude, the Metaphor lyeth in the word that is borrowed, and not in that, from whence it is borrowed: so in the larger similitude, the metaphoricall part of it resteth in the Redditiō, not in the Proposition. For example, Honour nourisheth Artes: the word Nourisheth being borrowed from meats nourishing the bodie, is a Metaphor as it is applied to Honour, and Artes, but attributed to his proper termes, it is no Metaphor, as to say thus, Meat nourisheth the body. In like manner (to make a full Similitude of it, in this sort) As meat nourisheth the body, so Honour nourisheth Artes, the Metaphoricall part of the whole, lyeth in the latter member, not in the first. So likewise when our Sauour saith, As a man deliuered from the possession of Satan, and receiuing him in againe, is in worse case after, then before: So the nation of the Iewes, once deliuered from the kingdome of Satan, so long as the church of God was amongst them, and comming into his subiection againe by refusing Christ, should bee in more miserable condition then in any former time: the Metaphoricall sentence of this Similitude, is in the last branch of it, not in the first. Not because there be no Metaphoricall words in the first, as Drie places, house emptie, swept, garnished, &c. but for that wee now speake of Metaphoricall sentences, not of wordes, I frame my argument from the Proposition of the Similitude, the sentence where-

of

of is literall and hitoricall, not from the Reddition, whose sense is allegoricall. Now then if a man should reason thus: The Reddition of the Similitude is Metaphoricall, therefore the whole is metaphoricall, it is all one as if one should say, The blacke Moore hath white teeth, therefore he is all white. Which kinde of argument euery chimney-sweeper would deride: and yet thus you reason from this place, and make it one of your chieftest props to vpholde your absurd conclusions with. But vnto this place I added another, where our Saujour saith to the vncleane spirit, *Come out of him, and enter no more into him.* Was our Sauours prohibition here in vaine? was this caution altogether needlesse and superfluous? How chauce you pass ouer this place without answering one word vnto it? It was too plaine: and you two could not agree where the Metaphor should lie, & therefore thought better to slip it ouer, then by handling it, and bewraying your owne absurdities to matre all. The reuerie therfore of Satan is plaine by the Scriptures: so that we need not the testimonie of any experience: yet I haue adioyned in the *Docktine* the report of the children dispossessed, and the euidence of many godly then present, which perceiued by their agonie, and the words of their resistance, what Satan attempted. You trifle ouer this with greater childishnesse then appeared in the childre; though but nine or tenne yeares old, and therefore I disdain to answer it. Again for prooffe of dispossession, I alleage the continuance of the *garners* brath since you answered: *Their former siters were but counterfeits, as themselves haue confessed.* A stale prooffe of their counterfeiting, and answered before. The seuen in Lancashire neuer confessed any counterfeiting.

Thus hauing confirmed Dispossession, I remoue that visuall objection, shewing it is now no miracle, for that it is not done by absolute power of Christ in bodily presence, as he sometimes did it when he was here conuersant on earth, nor by any committed extraordinary power to men, but by fasting and prayer as the means you an were first: as if I affirmed Christs absolute power to be ceased: which I affirme not, but account such affirmation blasphemie. He is not now present in bodie on earth, but worketh by his absolute authoritie still. Secondly, If Christs absolute authoritie be the only efficient, then the worke is miraculous, as euery which is a flat vntruth, as I haue proued at large in your tenth Dialogue. For works done by men as instruments are distinguished by the maner of working, and not by the principall cause. you say my Similitude from the

*Queene, and Lord Chauncelour is too absurd: for first, it is a case which neuer shall be, and so cannot illustrate. I had thought that ficta similitudo might haue had some force. But surely as you are full of newe Diuinitie, so I thinke you haue swallowed Margaritam Philosophia, you breake out on euerie occasion with such wonderfull new axiomes of Logicke. I intended that Similitude to the manner onely of Christs working, and you would extend it to the like glory of his works now, cleane beyond my purpose, and any good probabilitie. For are not Christs workes more glorious, when together with him selfe his seruants worke extraordinarily, as they did in the time of miracles, then now, when his seruants working is only ordinarie. But you will make the same similitude ouerthrow all miracles now, which I will yeeld for any, but for your selues: for you haue a priuiledge to do miracles, as is apparant in your tenth Dialogue.*

pag. 94.

Mat. 17. 21

Deut. 29. 29

pag. 95. 96.

Mat. 17. 21

Mat. 7. 17.

Hitherto for *Diffossission*, now for the *meanes*: which I affirme with many godly and learned of auncient and our owne times, to be *fasting and prayer*, out of the words of our Saviour, *This kinde geth not out but by fasting and prayer.* Where I calling it a *Secret ordinance*, oppose it to more euident places: you catch at the word, and come vpon me with *Secret things belong onely to God.* He that should deale with you had neede, as the Lawyers in writing their instruments, rather haue twentie words to spare, then to want one. You would proue, *these words did onely belong to the Disciples*, because the question was made by them, and the answer to them. The layler in the 16. of the Acts sayd to Paul and Silas, *What must I do to be saued?* They answered him: *Believe in the Lord Iesus Christ and thou shalt be saued,* &c. Doth this Scripture now, only belong to the laylor, because this question was made by him, & the answer vnto him? Of this kind be infinite other places. For interpretation of these words of Saint Matthew, I haue shewed you how I conceiue of them in your ninth Dialogue. Which exposition varieth somewhat from my former, not because I cannot maintaine it against any thing you object, but because I seeke after truth, and not after vaine iangling. If you can shew me any better, I will be readie also to change this. In meane season vnderstand how I reason from hence for the perpetual meanes of Fasting and prayer, which are mentioned by our Saviour in this place, either as helps to the extraordinary and miraculous faith of the Apostles, or else of the ordinarie. But they are not mentioned as helps to the extraordinary: for miraculous faith in the least quantity, though no more then a Traine of mustard seede

## THE 2. DIALOGVE.

29

was able without these helps to expell any diuell. Besides they could not be helps to that, which in it selfe had no being. For the Disciples had viterly lost their miraculous faith, else they had eie-cted the spirit. This also the word *Apistia, incredulity* doth note vn to vs. And an helpe is a conioyned force, which coniunction cannot be, where there is nothing to ioyne withall: and therefore they bee propounded in this place as helps to the ordinary faith, and so to haue a perpetuall ordinarie vse, when like occasion is ministred to vs, Againe, euery Exception is a compendious speech, comprehending in it two propositions, as, *Except a man be borne againe, he cannot see the kingdome of God:* wherein is concluded also this, *If a man be borne againe he can see the kingdome of God.* So, *None can come vnto me except the Father draw him.* Euery one can come vnto mee, whom my Father draweth. Againe, *Except these abide in the ship, you cannot be saued.* If these abide in the ship, you can be saued. And so in all other. In like manner, *This kind doth not go forth, but by prayer and fasting.* This kind doth go forth by prayer and fasting. Now the let men of iudgement determine whether here be not an euident confirmation of the ordinarie course of the Church in dealing after this maner: and whether it be not exceeding boldnesse, our Sauour affirming in such sort as is declared. That this kind doth goe forth by prayer and fasting, for any to open his mouth licenciously agaiſt it, and to disgrace it by al opprobrious tearmes he can. From hence too you may see, the similitude drawne from the Physitian saying to his patient, daungerously sicke of the Pleurisy, *You cannot liue, except you blea,* was to good purpose, if you could iudge what is to purpose.

Ioh. 33.

Iob. 6. 44.

Act. 27. 31

It is too tedious to repeat all your vntruthes, your absurd Non sequiturs, and idle profes. As if I thought it vnreasonable for Christ to reprove his Disciples negligence: if Christs answer were not proper to the Disciples, it was no answer: if he directed not his speech to the Disciples onely, he spake to no body present. This mettall craues no touchstone, it shewes it selfe by the eye what it is: therefore a knocke with an hammer is sufficient. So, *If his answer of Christ propounded an ordinance for al ages to come, there is an ordinance without an appointed subiect to vndergo the same.* Indeed this would be strange for Accidents to walke alone without subiects. It is a difficult matter to finde who should be the subiect of fasting and prayer: so likewise too of the kingdom of God, which our Sauour ordaineth to be sought in the first place, and food and rayment in the second, if we could tell who should

pag. 99

Matt. 6.

7

# REPLIE TO

30

2.100.

should do it. Besides, succeeding ages that could expell this cumbersome dinell, should haue more power the enier the *A. p*ostles had, which is false: for the *A*postles, their faith not sayling, could expell any diuell. Further, The *A*postles should saile in not declaring this ordinance vnto vs: concerning which ynough hath bene saide in the ninth Dialogue. Lastly, it is no established ordinance in this place, because *M. Darrell* affirmeth it hath bene an ordinance from the beginning. I answere, I doe not referre the originall to this place, but onely the Confirmation, no otherwise then I make Matrimony an established ordinance by our Sauour Christ, he renewing the institution of it.

Mat. 19 99

Mat. 12.27

Act. 16.13.

Again. I argue the meanes of fasting and prayer from the example of the Iewes Church in our Sauours time: wherein some did cast forth diuels: and yet were not in the number of our Sauours Disciples, neither did it in his name. You answere, *I contrarie my selfe, affirming else where, they did it by the finger of God*: I reply, you do not contrarie your selfe. but are enier like your selues, most assuredly concluding the selfe same working of the instrument, from the same manner of the principall agent: whereas the chiefe doer being the same, may and doth worke by the instrument diuersly.

2.101.

Again, say you *by mine owne confession, this ordinance as then was not established*. I answere, it was not so plainly, as when our Sauour confirmed it by these words, yet in generall it was, and practised in the Church before. Moreover, say you, *Those in our Sauours time besides his Disciples, cast out diuels by miraculous faith only*, for which you alleage the seuenth of *Matthew*. I reply, this scripture speaketh onely of the ejection of Satan. but sheweth not in what manner the same was performed, nor when. We do not leane upon any doubtfull uncertainties, as you would Rhetorically declare, if ye knew how: neither do we take the Lords holy name in vain, nor pray without faith, as you prate both without wit and conscience. I passe ouer your fooleries concerning *K. Wright*, & your fixe lies at one clap, contained in seven lines, as I can proue to your shame. But what speake I of fixe, when I dare say there be fixe hundred leafings in your two volumes? VVe neede not take things of whole sale men by retale: it is in ea'y matter to know by your lying whose children ye are.

cb.7-22

2.103.

2.104.

That Christs Speech might not be appropriated to the Disciples, hath bee re declared. Neither do I say and vsay, as you falsely charge me. The communication was betweene our Sauour and his Disciples, but the ordinance there mentioned is common to all: yet *Physiologus* fit these variable answers, as hee miscals them, doth tell vs a

pag. 105.

106.



sale of an Hermit, which coming to a Farmers house, and blowing his fingers to warme them, and his cottage to coole them, was sent packing by the Farmer, as a dissembling companion. But, to requite you tale, what if the like Hermit had come to some good mans house, and having on his face a faire shining visard with *A. W.* written vpon it, should vpon occasion have his visard shaken off, and vnder it shewe another face, signed with *I. De.* Might not the good man iustly at horre this double faced guest, and admonish all honest companie to beware of him? I will pardon you your sport at fast and loose for a shilling, though I might iustly make it sit saller vnto you, then you would vnloose againe in haste. But where is the contrarietie, I pray you, in making these words to bee spoken to the Disciples, and yet not onely to be understood of them? You would collect it after this manner, Because that a lacke of faith, and the kind of sin were the two impediments, wherefore the child was not deliuered. And that which is an impediment to snie, is also proper to the same partie, if we will beleue your Metaphysicks. For you must needs deriue your Assumption from hence. As if the Israelites being shut out of the land of promise for their vbeleefe, this impediment should bee so proper to them, that none but themselves should be excluded for the same: which absurditie is of that nature, that if your stick of fast and loose were a good sound cudgell, you deserve to be well laboured about the shoulders with it. Ever what should I pursue your seuerall absurdities? To rake after such scatterers were to fill a cart, rather then ones lap. In brieve for your whole dispute, to proue these words onely to belong to the Disciples: It incredulitie and omission of prayer and fasting were impediments onely to the nine Disciples, (for Peter, James and Iohn were not of this number) then they can be impediments to no body else. And so Peter, James & Iohn should cast out any kind of spirit notwithstanding the like incredulity, and omission of fasting and prayer. Yea all other Christians whatsoever should also in like manner. For what should hinder them, if they haue no impediment? And what impediment can they haue, these two being onely proper to the nine Disciples? See now how prouidently you tie these words to the Disciples onely, permitting larger power to all other Christians then to them. The contradiction you here charge me with is lame. It is palpably false, that I pag. 49. of the Doctrine auouch, there are some kind of spirits, which the Apostles (with all their power) could not possibly expell, but by prayer and fasting. Of this very error I do by sundrie reasons from pag. 44. of the Doc-

Heb. 3. 1.  
Or 4. 1. 2.

Mat. 17.



# REPLIE TO

132

trine, vnto page 48. confute Stapleton and Thyrenu, which notwithstanding you charge vpon me, & againe sticke not to say, that Stapleton, Thyrenu and my selfe agree herein, so shamelesse are you. But specially you make your selues merie with a cōtradiction, pag. 111. 112. I answere, The Disciples their not expelling the diuell out of the Lunatike, when they were destitute of miraculous faith, letteth not but that by miraculous faith they could expell any diuel. These I trust may agree together, without cutting the throat one of another.

pa. 113, &c.

1. Cor. 12, 9.

pag. 114.

That which you talke of *helping their weak miraculous faith by fasting and prayer*, is already answered. Further, I shewing that *fasting and prayer were not required as helpes in this place to miraculous faith*, say, that *Miraculous faith is of that kind, which is giuen without means to certaine men*: whereupon it must needs follow, that there being an *Avistia*, an vtter defect of miraculous faith in these Disciples, it was not to be recouered by fasting and prayer. You answere, *It was not begotten without meanes, because it was giuen by inspiration of God*. By which you make the holy Spirit to bee a meanes: whereas a meanes is but an instrument: And the holye Ghost together with the other two persons of holie Trinity is alwayes a principall efficient. Thus you confound heauen and earth together, & make nothing in the world to be done without means: neither any thing in the world to bee more then ordinary: for whatsoeuer is done by the same visuall and neuer ceasing meanes, must needs bee reputed ordinarie. There be few places in the field more replenished in the spring with stincking nettles and weedes, then your whole booke with such poyson full Hemlockes as these. But with all we haue a Discourse of an *Habituall & Actuall miraculous faith*: whereof the *habitual* is begotten by the Spirit and the word. Seeing therefore these causes cannot alwayes be effectlesse, and that they be euer working in the Church till the end of the world, it cannot be auoided but that *Miraculous faith* should be in the Church for euer: And the rather if we consider, what by your saying *miraculous faith* is: which you define to be nothing els, but an *vnindited persuasion*, by which we firmly beleene, that there is nothing impossible to God: But all the faithfull do vndoubtly beleene this, and therefore we haue still *Miraculous faith* remaining amongst vs, and shal haue so long as the Church sojournes on earth: yea the very diuels beleene this and so hauing miraculous faith, by your leaden rule shall bee workers of true miracles, I adde, they which were endued with the mira-

miraculous faith, had besides the perswasion of Gods omnipotencie, an vndoubted perswasion of the will of God, for the effecting of the wonderful matters, which besides or contrarie to nature they attempted for the good of the Church. Now for as much as the knowledge and assurance of the said will of God is not to bee had from the word, therefore the written word is not the onely ground-worke of miraculous faith, neither doth it come by the hearing thereof, as you affirme. For *Actuall* faith, you will haue it a speciall motion from the spirit of God, raised vp extraordinarily, whereby the action of faith shall not proceed from the *Habit* as from the next cause, as the action of iustice cometh from the habit of iustice, and so in all other qualities of that kind, but there shall be something in *Actuall* faith extraordinarily more then, was in the *Habituall*. If a man had your sharpnes he might quickly go beyond *Actiue* Nature, that cut the whetstone in peeces with his rasor. For the increase of miraculous faith by means, it is but needles to stand vpon it, considering we affirm an vtter defect therof at this time in the disciples, not some couered sparkes remaining in them, to be raised into flames by fasting and praier. For true miraculous faith, how little soeuer, is able with out these helps, to archine her designed worke. But then you will say, yea in effect do say, that the Apostles did superfluously ioyne praier with it. I answer, no more superfluously, then the Church doth ioyne Sacraments with the word. Faith of it self is sufficient, to apprehend Christ vnto saluation, and this faith is begotten by the word: Yet Sacraments haue their necessary vse; not to inable faith to that, which it could not with out them, but to confirme and strengthen it to doe her worke more chierfully, and with fuller assurance. Praier is the general instrument to be vsed in all holy workes what soeuer; and therefore the Apostles had warrant for their praier, & were free from all will-worship therein. I omit here for breuitie siue of your slanders, and two contradictions where-with you charge me; my selfe bring not author of any one of the contradictory propositions.

pag. 116.

pag. 117.

I proving that these wordes in S. Mattheus, *this kind eoth not our*, &c. belong not peculiarly to the Disciples, say, that if our Sauiour had rebuked them for not fasting & praying, they might haue excused their want of time, yea trifle exceedingly about this; at last you afford vs this worthy answer, that considering our Sauiours presence in the morning which for all the circumstances you can alleadge can not be long) they had time ynough to pray. *Antiquum obtines Crito,*

Matt. 17. 21

pag. 119

120. 121.

you

you must run your old byas. & impudently flap vs in the mouth with *time for prayr*, whē the question is of *time for fasting and prayer*. Againe, you will haue these words, *This kind goeth not forth but by fasting and prayer*, to be no severall reason rendred by our Saviour, why his Disciples failed in their purpose: whereas we haue shewed, it is a distinct thing from Miraculous faith, and not necessarily ioyned with it: and therefore not to concur in making one reason with the same. Moreover say I, if the Apostles in each weaknes of this faith, must of necessity haue betaken themselves to fasting and prayer, they should haue bene a whole day about a miracle: the exercise of fasting requiring this space, which would haue bene great hindrance to their speedy travel over the whole earth. You answer, *This is Iudaisme*. Belike also it is Iudaisme for Christians to pray, because the Jewes did so. But ynderstand good Reader, that the practise only of such ceremonies as the Lord appointed to be a difference betweene the Jewes and other people, is Iudaisme, not the exercise of such duties as be common to both. That which you doubt *what should become of the other part of the day*, if the diuell should be cast forth before none, becometh men which acknowledge no other seruice of God, but for their owne turnes. Is there no duty of thanksgiuing? no request for strength to the party dispossessed? no desire that the eye-witnesses might profit by it? you would haue Christians serue God, as the dog his maister for a bone. The rest is vnworthy to be repeated. & so was this, but that I would giue the Reader a taste. But what say you, that wil not haue a fast to continue for a day, to *A. Walker, alias To. Deacon* who in a booke of his called *the Footpath to fasting*, saith that in the day of our fast, we must be exercised in bearing, applying, and praying for the removing of God his iudgements, euen from morning to night? Do I (you false tongues) in pag. 48. and 49. of the Doctrine say, that the Apostles should haue stirred vp their weak faith by fasting and prayer, when I spend those whole pages to proue the contrary? O palpable slander, and extreame impudencie! Likewise you say, I affirme else where, *The Apostles faith was so strong as it needed no means to stirre vp the same*. And I would tell you, you say vntruly, but that your skore is so full that now you be desperate. Of these two bastardy propositions, conceived and brought forth by your selues, and not by me, you frame a Contradiction: saying therupon, that *I will turne ere I burne, yea with the turning of an hand, turne the ear in the par*: and then you tell my pupils, they may be pestilent proud

pag. 122.

4. 123. 124

K. S.

pag. 125.

of such a turne-about tutor. Here wee may beholde, as your honest dealing with me, so your eloquence and modestie.

Belides, I auouching the *Apostles strong faith after Pentecost*, able for miracles *whatsoeuer*, and therefore unlikely the Lord should appoint a peculiar course for them, for so short a time as from his transfiguration till then: you collect from hence the weaknes of their faith till Pentecost: which I graunt you, and more then that, namely, that their miraculous faith was vtterly extinct at this time. And therefore no vse of fasting and prayer for the extraordinarie work, but onely as it serued to the vsual maner of the Church in this case. But you wil proue the *apostles miraculous faith might saile after Pentecost*, because their faith sailed sometimes in doctrine and iudgement. That we may vnderstand your meaning, what do you

mean by Doctrine? what by iudgement? Doctrine vsuall, is publike teaching and instruction: Iudgement private thinking and opinion. Did the Apostles erre in publike teaching? You saye, *The Apostles and bretheren which were in Iuda*, thought the word of God was not to be preached to the Gentils.

Act. 11. 2.

You ground this our of these wordes. And when Peter was ascended to Hierusalem, they of the circumcision contended against him.

Who contended with him? The Apostles, say you, but without any warrant from the text. It seemeth *S. Luke* hauing mentioned the Apostles in the first verse, doth of purpose in the second vse these generall termes, *They of the circumcision*, to distinguish these

contenders with Peter, frō the Apostles. It may be the Apostles did not yet so clearly vnderstand this mistery, yet it is not likelie

they were in this case no more but equall to the weake bretheren, whereby they should ioyne in contention with them. Grant we also

an error here, it was only in iudgement, not in doctrine. And as for Peters not going rightly to the truth of the Gospell, it was not error

either in doctrine or iudgement, but a timorous dissimulation for the time. Iohn his falling downe before an Angell, was error through

Gal. 2. 13. 14.

sodaine passion, not proceeding from settled iudgement, much lesse auouched in publike teaching. Considering therefore these places

Rom. 19. 10

proue not that the Apostles erred in doctrine and iudgement, and that the Lord doth principally promise that the Spirit of truth should lead

them into all truth: and bring all things to their remembrance which Christ had told them, whereupon they be called *Skilfull Maister-builders*, and the Church is said to be built vpon the foundation of the

Ioh. 16. 13

& 14. 26.

1. Cor. 3. 10.

Ephes. 2. 20.

prophets and apostles. It is admirable you dare so confidently auouch

such an assertion, vpon so litle or rather no warrant, and of so dan-

M

gerous

# REPLIE TO

36

gerous consequence. You childishly cauilt at my speech, where I say, Their faith did not faile them, after they receiued the holy Ghost in that fulnesse: as if I had attributed such a fulnesse to this as is not incident to a creature: and yet I expressly distinguish it by note of restraint That fulnesse, that is, such a plenitull measure as I had spoken of before. Such an one, as was said of Stephen: *hee was full of the holy Ghost*; and of Paul: and of Elizabeth, when she brake forth into that heavenly salutation of the blessed virgin, *that she was filled with the holy ghost*. The same is said of Zachary when he prophesied, and of the Apostles, *that they were filled with the holy ghost*. And all these in the Concret, but in the Abstract without all limitation to haue the fulnesse of the Spirit, belongeth onely to a diuine person, the Father, the Sonne, and the holy Ghost. So that wharsoeuer person hath the simple fulnesse of the Spirit, the same is God, as well as hee who hath the fulnesse of the Godhead. Of Christ his fulnesse (to whom the Father hath not given his Spirit by measure) do all the elect receive, not the fulnesse it selfe, but grace for grace, that is, graces or gifts of the Spirit heaped vpon graces: euery one according to the measure of the gift of Christ, some one vntill their cup runne ouer. All which discourse when at last you conclude, that howsoeuer the Apostles were subject to error, yet they could not possible erre so long as they he *did the* voice of Christ: and but followed the onely directions of the Spirit of truth: And that they did neuer vniuersally erre: Moreover, that they did neuer euer from the foundation it selfe: & lastly, that they were recalled from their errors: what singular thing do you ascrib to the Apostles, that is not common to all beleouers? Are not the Apostles to be preferred aboue all other Ministers of the Gospell, and beleouers since their dayes? Yet you seeme to put them in the very same ranke. Nay, you say in the top of the same page, that there be some Testimonies of the Apostles, which onely but slipped from humane infirmities, and that these (how glorious they are in them) are not the testimony of Iesus, & therefore not the spirit of prophetic. you speake here very dangerously, that I say no worse.

You argue the defect of the Apostles *miraculous* faith, from their praying in working miracles, which rather is an argument for the continuance of it. For if it had bin vntoally exting, it had not bene to be obtained by prayer. but if you say Prayer declareth the weakness of it, and that you meane such weaknesse, as without prayer had beene able to effect the worke, it is false, as hath bene oft remembred

ag. 127. &c

Act. 7. 55. &c

13. 9.

Luc. 1. 41.

Act. 2. 2. 4

pag. 133.

pag. 135.

Act. 4. 29

30. & 9. 40

&c. 28. 8

unto youe but if you take weaknesse for some lesse measure of cheerefullnesse, which had neede be stirred by inuocation of Gods holy name, I graunt you such a weaknesse. but this is too weake to strengthen any whit your cause. you charge mee falsly in saying, I denie that the apostles faith might be did faile before they were filled with the holy Spirit. I know not how oft I affirme this, which you say is the very point I denie. Neither do I say, it was but *fortie dayes* betwene Christ his transfiguration, and Pentecost. I do wittingly let passe manie of your lies: it is a trouble to repeate them. you see no inconueniency to ascribe these words, *This kind* goeth not forth but by fasting & prayer, to the disciples themselves: whereas if fasting and prayer had beene necessarie as helps to their weake faith, that could not stand which our Saviour hath immediately before affirmed, that so much faith as a graine of Mustard seede should be able to do the greatest miracles. Howe this distinction of diuels is to be vnderstood, wee haue sufficiently declared in the Doctrin. you make a wonderful partition, when you interpret *This kind*, only to distinguish them from other creatures. The nature of a partition is, that the thing which is parted should be common to all the members. as in this state, creatures going out is the Generall agreeing to both the Specials; in this sort, Of creatures that go out of man some are diuels, and they goe not out but by fasting and prayer: some are of other kinde, and these of what nature soeuer goe out of a man without fasting and prayer. *Where* is man now become a cage for all creatures? Indeede this old Philosopher had woont to say, that Man is a little world: but you will giue vs a sensible vnderstanding of it, if horses, beares and Lyons, fowles, and creeping things of all kind, may haue an habitation in him. You haue bene so carefull all this while to free man from possession of diuels, that in the meane season you haue made him a Forrest to containe all sauage beasts in: I pray you what kind of creature doth lodge in your owne breastes? But you say, *That kinde cannot be referred to the diuels among themselves, because they beall of one kind as angels be, and also men.* Profoundly fatall if kind did onely note essence, as I haue before defined quality and condition: you brought vs euen now an example of *that* kinde; The bell of this kinde is *sinfulness*, whereby you said, *when we were created from men by three sexes or kind.* Is difference of sexe difference of Essence? So we speake of diuillish men. This kind of men is one to bee watched, of flatterers and ambitious persons. This kind of men spoakes all copious words in authority; of such as haue made shipwracke of

Matt. 17.

Doct. p. 46, 48

Doct. 49

pag. 136

Doct. p. 51

pag. 137



pg. 138

pag. 140. &amp;c.

Matt. 12. 25

Ec. 6. 25

41.

a good conscience, This kind of men groweth worse & worse. Now tell me, you *Answers*, whether *Kind* will carie no other sense but that, wherewith you cauill as be seemeth fresh Sophisters. Again, it is admirable, you could find no other similitude to declare the distinction of diuels by, but onely the *whole state of this kingdom of England*, comparing our most gracious *Soueraigne*, Gods Lieutnant amongst vs (I tremble to speake it) to the Prince of darknesse, and all the inferiour honourable orders of *Dukes, Earles, Lords, Iudges, Iustices, Knights, Gentlemen, yomen, &c.* to the lower sort of diuels. Could any men forget themselves so much, as that against all good manners, against honesty, against Christianitie, yea against nature it selfe, which hath printed in the minds of subiects all loyal and reuerent respect towards their most worthy Soueraigne. and in the hearts of inferiours all dutifull regard of their honourable Superiours, that you shoulde vtter such blasphemie against Gods sacred Ministers, and so noble and so flourishing estate as this is? He that priuiledged this, deserues hee should priuiledge no more. You thought to lade your *Exorcist* with the enuy of so odious a comparison: but all wise men will see, your selues are the *Exorcist*, and all the rest of the persons in your books, whom ye wake to speake what and how ye please: and therefore whatsoever they offende, they ought to be whipped on your backs. I take not vpon me to define of the *seuerall orders of diuels* further then the sacred word of truth is my guide. You contrariwise, that you might oppose your selues against me, sticke not to bend your forces against the verie Scriptures. For you will haue nothing now amongst them, but a *metre confusion, and a state without all order*: notwithstanding our Sauiour teacheth, that the power of darknesse is a kingdom: that there is a Prince of this kingdom called *Beelzebub*, and inferiour degrees called his *angels* (which whether they be all of them equal, or no without distinction or difference in any respect whatsoever, you should haue considered from these words, *He taketh vnto him seuen other spirits worse then himselfe*, & not vainly to haue trifled about the word *Exusia*) that there is a kind of policie of concord maintained amongst them, whereby this kingdom is vpholden. These things are plainly taught, and are such as no Christian may gain'ay, yet you would overthrow all this, striting for such a blended mingle amongst them, as is vtterly void of any the least distinction. But it is a true saying. *Fooles whilst they labour one euill to thrust into the contrarie presently runne.* VWhereas in these words, *This kind goeth not forth but*



# THE 2. DIALOGVE.

57

but by prayer & fasting. I have observed foure things: That there are two kinds of diuels: That one is more difficultly expelled then the other: that the child was possessed with one of the worse kind: that thence partly it was wherefore the Disciples cast him not forth: you returne. They which want arte to analyze the Scriptures, may here learne to be- *pag. 154* butcher a text, with Rhetorike ill be seeming vnmanerly clownes. But tell me, is there no difference between Analyzing, and making collections from a text? Prate no more of the *pag. 155* extraordinary faith of the Disciples, except you can make it good by sound reason they were indured with such kind of faith at that time. Our Saviour faith there was an *Apistia* in them, a thorough defect, whereby only they failed in that extraordinarie course they attempted.

But now you wil shew the impieties, absurdities and dangers which *pag. 157* follow of this doctrine. First, it is impiety to *158* *trouche any thing for truth that is not.* I acknowledge it is a greater impiety: but this doctrine doth not so. Secondly, *Lying wonders are the markes of Antichrist.* I answer, you ly falsly, when you make the casting forth of Satan by payer and fasting to be a lying wonder. Thirdly, it is impiety to *as-sume fasting and prayer (ex opere operato) may effect such a worke.* It is impiety indeed, but you may as truly charge me with this affirmation, as you might charge any sound hearted Christian that knowes *M. Deacon*, with affirming, that he is an honest man. Fourthly, it is impiety to *praphane prayer and fasting without warrants from the word.* We graunt also this, but withall ioyne vnto it. That it is no lesse impiety to call that prophaning of prayer and fasting, which is warranted by the word, as in this case it is. Lastly, it is impiety (say you) to make prayer and fasting, which of God are appointed *ea beo* helpes vnto faith, a sole meanes without faith for expelling of diuels. I subscribe vnto it, and wish with all my heart, that he which faith so may receiue the reward of a deceiver: but if such cogitation was euer farre from my breast, that such impudent slanderers might be branded in their foreheads with this marke: *False accusers of their brethren.* I doubt not but you haue read these words of the Discourser, (who neuer speaketh vntruly for mee, whatsoeuer hee doth against me) *M. Darrell* confesse the necessitie of faith in the ordinarie means. *Disce. pag. 48* Your absurdities (for so they are indeed) with the dangers partly foolishly, & partly falsly imagined, what should I vouchsafe to re- peate them? I will leaue these and such like to the Reader, able now by that which hath bene saide, for all your maske to discerna you.

H

you

# REPLIE TO

40.

159.

You vpbraide me with *hiding my selfe for feare of perill*. I haue learned by the commandement and example of Chrilt Ielus himselfe, his Apostles, and of the Martyrs in all ages, that I may, nay, ought to giue place to the rage of man, especially not forsaking in the meane season any duty that concernes me. Yet that you may know I am not cleane runne away, by that time you haue read my *Survey* and this *Reply*, tell me whether you haue not met with some bodie to cope with in the field. You will not allow Christians, if they

160

*perceiue not their first endeuours to preuaile, to betake themselves to further humiliation*. whereas this is the practise of the Saints, as to continue their supplications till the Lord haue graunted, so to increase their exercise, the more difficult they proue the Lord to be. First, *Dauid* besought the Lord for his child, & as it may seeme without fasting, then not obtaining, he ioyned fasting and watching with-

Sam. 12.

17.

all: thirdly, he continued the like till the seventh day. Did hee in intent a seuen dayes fast in the beginning? Concerning the efficacy of prayer and fasting, we haue the same Coleworthe sod againe. You

161. &c.

talkes, as if I made prayer and fasting for dispossessing, an *unwritten ordinance*: whereas I onely suppose, that if it were not expressly set downe, yet for that it is to be collected out of the generall places of Scripture, as where the Lord doth summon vs, in the day of our as-

2.22.12.

spection vnto weeping and mourning, to baldnesse and girding with sackcloth: and to call vpon him in the time of our aduersitie, and such like: and because also by experience we proue it to be effectual, this were sufficient warrant to vs for the ordinance of God in that behalfe. You might therefore haue spared your paines in proouing the sufficiency of the words of God, till you meete with some Papist, in which number I thanke the Lord I am not.

167

For your demaundes, if dispossessing be *non ordinarie*, what be the things ordinary in it. To satisfie you (though you little deserue it) for the medicine, I answere it is fasting and prayer: the operation, is the mightie power and wil of God, apprehended instrumentally by our faith: the ministeriall hand to apply this medicine, is the assembly of Christians gathered for this purpose. The theorie, or skill to direct this hand, is the knowledge that they bee warranted in so doing from the worde of God: the meanes to imprint this skill in those physions breasts, are the meanes of knowledge, hearing, reading, meditating: the basis of this skill is their faith, which is more confirmed by the often practise of the Church in all times. Nowe then, if you cannot see what is ordinary in this worke, bewaile your ordinarie blindnesse,

## THE 2. DIALOGVE.

47

blindesse which will not suffer you to behold the truth. That which followeth is no lesse foolish then false, which you talke of *saith working ex opere operato*: as also that *fasting and prayer cure by way of miracle*: that *fasting and prayer* is no *supernaturall* manner of cure: & that if it be *supernaturall*, then it is *extraordinarie*. Is it possible for men to dote in this manner? But if the light that is in men bee darknesse, how great is their ~~darknesse~~?

pag. 168  
Diast. 6.

To the testimonies of ancient & later writers alleaged by me, you answer first, that *I wresl open their mouths, and make them speak what I please*. It is true, they speake what I please, because in this matter I speake nothing but what pleaseth the. but you insinuat that I peruert them. If you could haue shewed one syllable this way, al the world should haue heard of it. Besides, you haue already testified in your former *Discourses*, that they spake, as I report the. Secodly, you say, *they speake nothing at all to my purpose in hand*. My purpose in alleaging them was to shew, first, that men in these dayes may be disposed of diuels. Secodly, that *fasting & prayer* haue bene vied by the most learned and godly in the Church from time to time, since miracles ceased, for expelling of Satan out of the possessed. Nowe whether they spake to these *purposes* or no, because your selues haue lost your eyesight, let others that can iudge of colours say what they thinke. Your third answer is, that *I haue not their owne examples or practise, but only their bare reports concerning the practise of some others conuersing among them*. This likewise is ynttrue. *Tatullian* and *Cyprian* reckon themselves in the number of them which did expell diuels. And *Chrysostome* was present in the congregation, and preached two seuerall dayes at least, when publike prayers were made for expelling of Satan out of persons possessed, brought to that end into the Church at the commandement of the Deacon. And therefore wee haue these three mens *practise*. But admit that none of them had made mention of their owne *practise*, might not their iudgment & counsell that *seruent prayers are to be vsed for the healing of the possessed*? specially seeing diuers of them adde, that they haue knowne some that haue bene healed by the prayers of the godly. Fourthly, say you, *they giue their aduise for the exercise of prayer alone*. And this is your fourth lye, for some of them mention prayer & fasting. Thus much for reply to your generall answers, let vs nowe heare those which be particula. To *Origen* you answer, that he *insinuateth*, *imply the supposed efficacie of fasting and prayer, but putteth downe no practise of it as of a perpetuall ordinance*. Marke how false liers fault in their speech.

Dei. 58

pag. 169

speech. Did *Origen* suppose such an efficacy of fasting and prayer & yet not thinke it was Christs ordinance, and to bee vled? Whence could it haue efficacy, but from Christ? Or to what purpose was efficacy, if to no vse? He therefore that acknowledgeth the lawfull efficacy of fasting and prayer, doth also acknowledge, that there is an ordinance of fasting & prayer to such an end. *Tertullian* you say. *Speakes of manie pretended deliuerances from Satan, but sheweth not the manner how they were freed from them.* What? Doth *Tertullian* in his Apologie of Christianitie against the Gentils, to the whole state of Rome, alleage certaine counterfeite deliuerances from Satan, to countenance Christian religion with? Doth he vse such policie in writing to the Gouvernour *Scapula*, to gaine credite to the profession of the Gospell? Surely you are either not well in your wits, or which is worse, you haue for filthy lucre sake conspired to make but meere fables of the great works of God. But be sheweth not, say you, the manner how they were deliuered. Do you stick at this matter? you will not haue it by miracle in any sort: and therefore, say wee, by fasting and prayer. Nay but, will you say, if it were at all, it was by Miracle, and Miracles were ceased before his dayes. Therefore speake plainly, and tell *Tertullian* to his face that he lyes, that hee deluded the world with his pretended deliuerances. This is your meaning: and this answer would be short. How *Cyprian* is to be understood, we shall know (say you) by *Iames Pammelius*, who telleth vs, That the Exorcists office was not then in anie vse of the church, because that office being ioyned with the gift of Miracles, did continue but for a time. I do not alleage *Cyprian* for the office of Exorcists, but for the casting forth of diuels in those dayes, which he testifieth plainly, saying. And the diuels by torment of words are cast out of bodies possessed. To this adde, if you will *Pammelius* his testimonie, that miracles were then ceased, and so we conclude, That there were casting forth of diuels in *Cyprians* time, & yet not miraculous. But yet for *Iames Pammelius* let me tell you thus much: wheras you alleage his words for the ceasing of Exorcists before that time, and also that a little after he should say, That the crafts and iugling sleights of counterfeite Exorcists & coniuering priests, they are long since apparently euident: yea come to the very eyes of the blind: I marvelled greatly to heare these words of *Iames Pammelius*: I knew he affirms the cleane contrary, maintaining strongly by testimony of Antiquitie that office of Exorcising both of spirits possessing, and in Baptisme. I turned my *Cyprian*, but I could find no such words of his. And therefore either you

*Epist. 55*  
*76. edit.*  
*Pamm.*  
*Antwerp.*  
*ad b. Petri*  
*1589*

you haue met with an edition later then the last, or els you are as notable in belying mens writings as the most shamelesse Papist of them all. To the rest, as *Chrysostome*, *Peter Martyr*, *Keruitius*, *Phil. Melancthon*, *Brza*, *Vogellius*, *Danew*, *Chassanius*, all of them most plainly testifying dispoession, and that by meanes of fasting and prayer, you answere not one word, but for the lenght of their footinges, referre vs to that which hath beene spoken of the former. Indeed these treade in the steps of the former, and of all the godly learned that went before them & therefore by them we may gesse their footinges: and so likewise by your three wirtles answers to the three former we may easily gesse what would be your answer to these, namely all the absurd shiftes you could deuise to elude their testimonies, as not hauing in purpose to find out the truth, or to yeild to it beeing found, but by hook and by crooke to maintaine your owne giddy fancies, whatsoever eyther Scripture, or any other shall saye against it. What doe I therefore disputing with such companions, which make not truth their end, but some other peruerse respect, I know not well, what? Surely Christian Reader, that which I do is for thy good, to laye open vnto thee their vnconscionable iuglings, least by any coloured pretences thou shouldst be beguiled by them. Did not I well to bind the to their good behavior by a publike Instrument in their *Discomfesse*. Thou seest they haue not one worle of truth to say against the practise of the Church of God from the Apostles time till now. But you are weary of these authenticall witnessses and therefore betake your selues againe to your woted reasonings, where you may haue more scope of words, and more hope to darken the truth.

If, say you, *prayer and fasting bee an established ordinance, then it should be alwayes effectuall.* I answere, yow seldome bring an. If but there is a lye in the end of it. The prophet complayneth, *How long Lord wilt thou hide thy face for ever?* Because David obtained not by his sute his Sonnes life. he might by this rule haue bid praye and fasting adue. Infinite are the instances: it is meruaile you could meet with none of them, to cause you to hold in so grosse an vntruth. But I crie you mercy, you meane effectuall in regard of vttermost issue, not of the present time. Now then frame your reason. *The ordinance of god is alwayes effectuall, prayer & fasting is not alwayes effectuall, & so not god his ordinance in this case.* I answere, if you take effectuall for the last issue and such help as is expedient, you say vntruly of prayer and fasting: If you meane effectuall for  
pag. 170.  
2. Sam. 12.  
18  
pag. 171.  
172, 173.  
O
sensible,

# REPLIE TO

44

sensible, imagined and present helpe, then is it as false, you say of gods ordinance. And this if you mark it, will suffice for all you prattle about this matter. So likewise, how *Dispossession* now is no miracle enough, hath beene spoken, except you can bring vs something of more weight, then hitherto you haue done. Further obiect that here they spare not to denie (though in as couert termes as they can) the witnesse of *Terrullian*, *Cyprian*, *Chrysostome*, and of al the rest before alleaged, or that can be. Moreouer, if this will not serue, for compendiousnesse sake, and more securitie of their cause, they deny the conclusion, The argument is, *If dispossession by prayer and fasting be miraculous, then Terrullian, Cyprian, Chrysostome, and others wrong be miracles, when they expelled diuels after this sort: but this is false: and therefore the first.* To this you answer: *Secondly, if it be true that here tofore or nowe spirits bee expelled by sole prayer and fasting, then is the worke a miracle: which is the contrarie affirmation to the conclusion.* When you talke of *sole prayer and fasting*, you haue a secret meaning of your owne of *sole prayer* without faith. Concerning which I tell you again, that if *M. Walker* & you haue such a kind of prayer and such a kind of faith, as vsually are separated one from another, you may do well to dispute of such matters betweene your selues, for my part I allowe no such prayer, neither doth the Church of God.

pag. 174. 175

pag. 176.

pag. 177

pag. 179.

You argue, that *dispossession* is not by *historicall* or *temporary* faith, because God hath appointed it to *miraculous* faith: which thing if it had beene proved in the beginning, we had done long since. Further, you see not wherein *infirmitie* faith should be far better then *Temporary*, if this doth cast out diuels, as if to cast out diuels out of the bodies of men, were all in all. Besides, if *historicall* faith be sufficient, diuels might cast out diuels. But what if they will not? you are neuer a whit the nearer. Such trumperie shal I haue no other answer. For answer to your fourth reason I say, a reprobate may apprehend the mercies of God the Creator, but not of God the Redeemer, And such apprehension for the eiecting of Satan nayd off.

You slander me, when you say, that in *dispossession* of *Somners* we purposely pray'd to teach the beholders, that the work was effected by the onely power of him to whom we put vp our prayer. But what is it to say you slander me? You make no more account to slander me, then to fillip me. Again I doe not say, that parties bewitched haue no warrant from the Scripture to fast & pray, (as is apparant in the place by you quoted, where I counsell them to this holy exercise) but only, that ther is not such expresse mention in the word

pag. 182

pag. 183.

184. 185

for



for the curing of them, as for parties possessed. And therefore all that is an idle dispute which you purpose for diuers pages together in this matter. You would faine haue me a companion in this wicked assertion, which your selues maintain as is apparant afterwards. pag. 186

But note (good reader) for an egregious blasphemy, that these *Answerers* make the Lord guiltie of the horrible sins committed by the wicked in seeking to the diuell for help in their miseries. For how doe they proue it to be an absurditie to condemn peoples going to the diuell for helpe? Surely thus, if it be a sinne to seeke helpe of the diuell, we shall make the Lord guiltie of this sin without whom it cannot be done. I haue seelt what blasphemie this proposition containeth: for it plainly affordeth that which before I say. And the Conclusion, to wit, it is no sinne to seeke helpe of the diuell, is a conclusion of monstrous impietie. So where they would proue, *There is no warrant from the wordes for prayer and fasting to be used in behalfe of parties bewitched,* there argument as of this sorte, *if there be no warrant from the word* pag. 188

*that sole prayer & fasting haue any power of themselves ex opere operato, to remove supernaturally, sicknesses of God, then there is no warrant for parties bewitched, to use fasting and prayer as helpefull in this case.* But the first, say they, is true, & therefore the second. But what do you stick at parties bewitched? You should haue inferred generally, there is no warrant nor use of fasting and prayer at all for any thing *ex opere operato*. O men stricken with the blindness of Sodome, which before the dore, seek the dore, and cannot find it. Is it your foolishnes, that you cannot tell what you avouch? Or your shamelesnes, that you passe not though your names should be deservedly odious to all? Or is it, that you do so far despise all the learned of this land, that you thinke there is not one man able to discern such prodigious falsehood. Such wretched persons would rather be confuted with a three corded whip, than by the writings, or wordes of any. And if that will not serue, it were meete such order might be taken with you that the Church of God sustaine no damage by you.

Whether I have so fondly trauesed this question of possession as you say, I leave it to the goodly learned to determine, to whose censure I willingly submit my selfe both in this & in all other my writings. But as for your iudgments, I passe not. First make it appeare, you haue eyes in your owne heads. Before you take vpon you to tell what is straight, or crooked in me, then sanctifie your mouths by confessing, your lies, your sleanders, your blasphemies, before you giue sentence pag. 190



tence of any my doings. In the mean season, if you will needs be barking, I will find such a bone for you to gnaw on, as shall bee fit for your chaps,

47. 191, 192  
93.

Concerning the counsell I gave for fasting and prayer, it was grounded from hence: *that in all iudgements* (of which kind possession is) *we are called to humiliation*, for which I cite in the margine an induction of diuers examples. To which you answered first, *that without particular knowledge of the iudgement, prayers could not be made in faith to remove it*: which is one of those Axioms that neuer fails you, such an one as *Abahs* prophets were inspired with, when they counselled him to warre against *Ramoth*. Shall not the poore countrey sicked man pray to God for some comfort in his distresse, because he doth not know particularly the nature of his disease? Secondly, that the quoted Scriptures onely testifye the peoples humiliation by prayer and fasting, so oft as any strange iudgement was inflicted, but proue not essentiall possessions and dispossessions by those means. yet they proue the counsell I gave was warrantable, and this I content my selfe with. It is enough if my poore premises afforde mee one naturall and orderly conclusion at one time. Euery mans Cow can not bring forth colts, as yours do.

48. 194.  
95. 196.

To conclude, you tell vs your great confidence in the cause, which no man needs to doubt of, if he consider your former arrogant boldnesse: nor much maruell at as strange, if he call to minde your vnderstandable blindnesse. But if your learning and conscience were more, your confidence would be a great deale lesse. Then you inferre of the premises, *That if there be no possession, nor dispossession now by fasting and prayer, how greatly they haue erred that haue ascribed it, and how much they are to be blamed which cannot endure it should be impugned*: But contrariwise say I, if all these things be true, which you denie, as hath beene proued by stronger reason, then you possibly withstand, what doe you deserue which haue troubled the Church with newe and singular opinions in these points: and in broaching them, haue offered to the world to choke them withall other verie many grosse, fantastickall and impious absurdities? and yet you dare intitle your fooleries, *The infallible truth*, and such, as *Glory & praise is to be giuen to our Lord for these his lately reuealed counsels by you concerning these intricate questions*. O intolerable proud ignorance! Haue you by late reuelation cleared these intricate questions? Indeede your assertions be late: for they were neuer heard of in the Church before: but they were neuer reuealed vnto you by the Spirit of truth, but

but by that lying spirit, whose image doth lively appeare almost in every argument you handle. And yet that my selfe be not onely iudge, let any man of vnderstanding waigh with equal balance that little that hath bene *replied*, & compare it with yours, & then giue sentence: whether any since the time of our peace by our gracious Queene, professing the gospell, hath published any writing of diuinitie that doth come neare these your treatises in number of vn-sound notions, in misconstructions & wrestings of Scriptures, in absurd collections, in impudent reiecting the authoritie of the ancient, in shamelesse pretending the names of good authours against their owne meanings, in childish stumbling in the first rudiments of Arts, in most frequent lying and slaundering, and which is greatest of all, in dangerous and scandalous assertions mixed with some notorious blasphemies: and then it may be you shall carie the bell of al that haue written in our times. Great cause there is, we should all make bonfires for the publishing of your bookes, or rather of your published bookes: but especially *M. Bishop*, who got the priuiledge ad *imprimendum solum*, I beleue he bespewes your sinners for it.

## A REPLIE TO THE THIRD DIALOGVE,

**Y**our *Vses* are 'sutable to your doctrine. For what other thing can proceede from a Cockatrice egge, then a serpent? Yet *Lycanthropus* admires and appaides them: and so perhaps may some doe, that be not well in their wits. But they which haue receiued the anointing, that teacheth vs concerning all things, will abhorre your prodigious dotage, and the more when they consider your *vses*, which manifest plainly that your errors be not about strawes and rushes, such as without danger might be contentined and neglected, but which draw after them most perillous consequences, mightily shaking the verie foundation, and chiefest pillars of our faith. You pretend that this your doctrine of finall determination of possessions & dispossessiones of Spirits and Diuels, affordeith first, an holy meditation concerning the vndoubted faithfulnessse and truth of our eternall God, in that he promising four thousand years fully before, to send the seed of a woman, which should bruiſe the serpents head, hath in his owne de-

1. Iob. 2. 27

determined

*promised time fulfilled the same, by sending his sonne. We beleuee and know is, that not one iote of the Lordes promise hath failed, but doth your doctrine yeeld any confirmation of it? Nay verily, but doth vtterly ouerthrow it, and make the Lord of truth to haue falsified his word. The Lord hath promised by sending his sonne fully to subdue and Vanquish Satan: your doctrine doth teach vs, that Christ by his death hath onely made an end of possessions and dispossessions of diuels, that is, that he hath only deliuered Demoniakes such as were actually tormented in their bodies by the Diuely. What? Are all the Elect Demoniakes? Haue you not taught vs, that Possessions were very rare before Christs time, and that it was verie probable there were none at all in Israel, till a little before his comming, and none after the Apostles? Are only then these men deliuered by Christs death? You haue quit the Lord indeed w<sup>e</sup>l of his promise. He promised the breaking of Satans head, you make that Christ hath scarce pulled one lock of haire fro his head. He promised deliuerance for al his elect, you restrain this deliuerance only to men actually posselt with diuels. He promised vs a gift, as it were, of an hundred thousand talents: you make him to haue satisfied his promise in bestowing vpon vs an hundred pence. Do men satisfy bondes in such manner? Doth a Creditor, to whome is owing a thousand pound, hold himselfe contented in receauiing two or three shillings. Tye vpon your comfort: you are miserable comforters. But this determination you say, of Satans Actuell possession may confirme faith and hope for the vtter subuersion of the whole kingdom of darknes. I answer, you ly, falsely, if your doctrine be true. For hope can expect no more then faith doth presently imbrace, but by your teaching, faith doth not imbrace a full vanquishing of Satans kingdom by Christs death, but onely an end of Actual possessions (which neither was accomplished, as hath bene shewed) and therefore hope cannot looke for any further subuersion of Satans kingdom then is alredie. Now let the godly iudge what lyeth hidden in your doctrine, whether they be things to be tolerated, and coldly dealt in or no; or rather of such nature, that if you will not reclaimie them, all louers of the truth ought to spit in your faces in detestation of your errors. So likewise when you speak of God his al sufficiency, of Christs triumph, and of the Diuels captiuitie, who so euer trusts to your doctrine in these poynts, shall perceaue he leans vpon a staffe of reede, which when hee shall stand in neede of it will breake a sunder, and run through his body as may suffice*

### THE 3. DIALOGVE.

49

y be seene by this litle that I haue nowe remembred, as also by that hath beene more fully declared, in Suruey of your Sixt Dialogue. your vses then are wretched, and therefore I leaue them.

The proper vse that can be made of your doctrine is, that Christians should now shew their wisedome in practising that rule our Saviour Christ hath taught them, namely this, *beware of false prophets which come to you in sheepes clothing, but inwardly they are rauening wolues.* Thou hast seene in this booke of theirs, good Reader, these

Math. 7. 15

men professing themselves, *The Lord his worshippest on earth* when they beginne their disputations, to begin the same with prayer, recreating themselves with singing of psalmes: to wish the *Reue- rend brethren* if they haue faulted either in matter or manners to *consue* them and spare not, *withall* desiring the blessing of God to light

In the sub-  
scription to  
three of their  
Epistles.

on their hearts for their labours that wayes haue vied many wordes of goodly pretence, of great obedience to the magistrate, of great care of their brethrens good, of great lynceritie in calling euery thing to the triall of the Scripture, and many such other faire shewes.

Dial. Discou  
pag. 7, 262.  
Epist. Decd.  
Ans.

On the other side thou mayst see by this *Suruey* and *Reply* what abundance of vile and grosse errors is packed vp in these their treatises, *What* litle conscience they make of god his truth, *Of* lying & slander, *how* exceedingly they haue trusted in each seuerall point, and now by these vses how all tendes to this, to discredit Gods truth in fulfilling his promise, to impeach his sufficiency for vanquishing of satan, to restrain Christs triumph to a thing of nothing, to limit Satans captiuitie with loosing of a skone, and such like: which thinges beeing thus, now it will shortly and easily more appeare, whither these men be false prophets, or not. For if they shal recant themselves of their errours, and as they haue given publike scandall to the Church, in labouring to draw men after their fancies, so againe in submission to the truth, disclame all such opinion dissonant from the sacred word, throwing the first stone at themselves, to the end all other may beware of them, then they shall be manifested to haue shipped but of infirmities, and to be such indeed, as they would seeme. Otherwise if they will still maintaine & defend them, then thou seest good reader, these mens sheepes clothing, and how for thy sake I haue pulled it ouer their eares, wherby thou mayest behold them to be inwardly rauening wolues: if they be to be iudged wolues, not only which rent the members of our bodies in sunder, but also & much more they, which by infecting men with pestiferous opinions, deliuer the to satan to be

torne

*hil. 3. 19.  
Tim. 3. 5.  
ud. 16.*

*Cor. 11. 19*

toorne in peeces both bodies and soules. In this case it will behoove the Christian Magistrate, both Ciuill & Ecclesiasticall, to take order, that such cruel deuouring beasts may be driuen from Christs fold: & that they would consider, that they make not dissensions & scandales contrary to the doctrine we haue learned, which stand for the truth, but they which oppugne the truth. It is the rebell that makes ciuill war: the faithful subiects weapons are not against the peace but for the peace, neither is it the dog barking in the night, that disquiets the shepherdes, but the Wolves approaching: the keepers stirring is to be commended, & the theues assaulting he is to be defended. This vse then the Magistrate is to make of your doctrine: generally all the Christians of this land, are to take it as a watchword to auoyd you as Scorpions, that they may know you to be men, which haue made your bellies your god, & to glory in your shame: which haue a forme of godlynes & haue denied the power of it, whose mouthes speake proude things, hauing the persons of men in admiration for aduantage sake. These manner of men are fortold should come in these last dayes, & our Church doth already feele it by lamentable experience. If thou shalt make this vse, Christian reader of their booke it shall not bee altogether vnprofitable for thee. For *It must needs be that beresies should come, that they which are appointed among vs may be knowne.* The Lord therefore strengthen vs so many as be of this number, to stand for his truth, and giue, vs wise dome to discern those which would craftily vndermine it, that all such wicked workers beeing defeated, wee may constantly walke in the puritie of it, till the day of our Lorde Iesus Christ, to whom, with the father and the holy Spirit be all honour and praise for euer.

Amen.

FINIS

Here followeth my answer to the Contradictions  
they charge mee with.

The Discouersers charging me with a shamefull companie of Contradictions, no lesse then thirtie, I first framed an answer to them, with full purpose to publish it, & therein haue made it plaine there is not a contradiction. But this my I reatise prouing much larger then I intended, & the answer to them being of little or no vse, saue only to cleare my selfe of this slander, and to discouer their filthinesse, which needeth not, I thought good rather to suppress, then publish it: yet so as I will giue thee, good Reader, a taste thereof, and of their vpright dealing herein, assuring thee of my credit, that euen such be the rest of their contradictions.

Darrell, say they, in his Doctrine pag. 54. saith, that prayer and fasting being vsed aright, will certainly prosper either to the removing or sanctifying of the iudgement. But pag. 56. he saith, there is no assurance to preuaile.

contradiction  
.23.

Answers.

I answer. There is no assurance to preuaile, that is, we can not be sure the partie shall be deliuered, the means being vsed, for so are my wordes. Had then I sayd pag. 54. fasting will certainly prosper to the removing of the iudgement, and no more, I had contradicted that I say, pag. 59. but adding, or sanctifying, a child may see here is no contradiction. Such a contradiction is this: Certainly the Discouersers will either be ashamed of their contradictions, or their sinne is the greater: Assuredly they will not be ashamed of their contradictions. And this: The sun is either vnder a cloud, or set. It is not vnder a cloud.

contradiction  
.23.

In his Detection 163. Darrell saith, fire hath power to burne, or as the same pag. hath no power to burne.

All that we reade Detection 163. is that Somers band being in the fire was not burnt. Would euer any man, these two excepted, hence collect a contradiction? How many thousands in this land haue said the same, and among them not a few that be learned, & yet I dare say neither learned, nor vnlearned euer feared they spake contraries. Shadrach, Meshach, & Abednego being in the fire were not burnt, and yet they that cast them into the fire were burnt. I trust you wil not say here is a contradiction. But confesse both these to be true. Fire naturally burneth, but restrained by God the oger-rules o' nature, it doth not burne. Secondly, you should first haue shewed where I say, Fire hath power to burne, before you told vs that I speake contraries.

Ans.



contrad. 24.

In his Doctrine pag. 2. he saith, that it sueth altogether with Satans nature to be filthy or wicked in speech: But Detection 175. he saith, that it sueth as well with his nature to use good and holy Speeches.

Ans.

My wordes Detection 175. be, Holy wordes have becne uttered by Satan. Telme is this a false proposition? Or yet this: vncleane and blasphemous speeches sue excellently with the nature of the vncleane spirit. If both these be true, which none will deny, with what truth doe you say that I speake contraries, whereof the one must needs be false. These men sure had forgot when they doted of this contradiction, that the diuel is as well by nature subtil, (and in his subtiltie ready to transfigure him selfe into Angel of light) as vncleane and wicked. Of this stamp they haue 18 contradictions more.

contrad. 11.

In his Doctrine 47. He saith the disciples by vertue of their so large a commission could cast out a diuel of any kinde. But pag. 50. the Lunaticke child was possit with one of the worst kinde of spirits, and that thence it came the disciples could not cast him out.

Ans.

To make this contradiction they haue detracted part of my words in either proposition. In the former these, if they saith failed not: which words, or words to the same effect in the afore said pag. 47. & the two pages precedent. I vse no lesse then twelue times. In the latter proposition where I say, thence partly it came, they detract this word partly, whereby I inuoluntarie the Disciples faith did at that time faile them, when they could not cast the diuel out of the lunaticke child, so that their incredulitie was one let, which oft els where I expresse. And this you well knewe, as appeareth by your next contradiction, the twelfth I meane. What meant you then thus to separate and rent asunder those words which of purpose I had coupled together? And by detracting that which in either of the propositions is so materiall, and in the one I inculcate so often, to pretend a contradiction where you knew none was? No hath bewitched you to vse such curled deuises, for the compassing of your contradictions? A cursed pretence must this needes be, seeing it can not be done in ignorance. For you cannot be ignorant hereof, that the wordes detracted by you I vse, specially those so oft iterated, and that in those pages from whence yee haue the said contradictions proposition: considering also that to make another contradiction you along the very same words you omit here, & that fro the same page, as witnesseth the contradiction here following. Neither can you be ignorant of this, that these wordes being vsed and added by me, I am not contrary to my selfe, yea hence it is that you did

omit



omit them. It must needs therefore be that you knowing here was no *cantr* addition, haue against that knowledge of yours (by this deuise of detracting these words) made yet a faire shew to the world of a contradiction. Here is no contrarietie except these be propositions contradictory: The Disciples could cast out a diuell of any kind, if their faith sayled not: The Disciples their faith sailing could not cast the diuell out.

In his Doctrine 47. he saith the Apostles saith sailed not: But pag. 48 he saith it sailed at this time when Christ spake to them and in this very worke.

contrad, 31

Ans,

These wordes, the Apostles saith sailed not, you could omit when such omission serueth for your purpose, as appears by the former contradiction: But now when they must stand you in some streade, they are not to seeke. He wanteth the vse of one of his senses, that smelleth not here your stinking breath. My wordes be these. They were able to cast out a diuell, if their faith sailed not: which imply not that the Apostles saith sailed not, as you would haue it, for otherwise here is no contradiction, but rather the contrary, that their faith did at some times saile them. Again, though the wordes The Apostles saith sailed not, with the former are true, yet they are separated from their follower, I may truly say they are not mine. In your *Discourse* you say, if the *disciples* could cast out a diuell, they could not. By your wife rule you there affirme, that *the disciples* could not, & in the last booke pag. 24 where you haue these wordes, If Angels be created, then are they eternally: you affirme, that Angels be created: yes pag. 28. you say Angels be created. These propositions be contradictory, and the former of them absurd, and so here is a contradiction (forsooth) and an absurditie, when indeed there is neither. Here is parricide and childish sense. If I would write but in this one crooked step of yours, how easily could I make a booke of your contradictions, and another of your absurdities. But suppose I had said no more then you produce: vz. The Apostles saith sailed not: thence ye could not inferre a contradiction: except I had spoken of the same time mentioned in the latter contradictory proposition. Their faith might not saile them at one time, and yet saile them at another time.

In Doctrine 50. *Abraham's* player is made a vile measure of conception and procreation of children: But pag. 60 another measure is found appointed of God for that purpose, or els it would proue a miracle.

contrad, 15

As before by detracting so here by adding you abuse both mee, Ans. and

and the Reader: The words I use be these *Who will deny but that as the sinne of Abimelech (in taking Sarah, Abrahams wife unto him) had just up every woman of the house of Abimelech, so the prayer of Abraham was the meane whereby they were opened, & that iudgement taken away.* Do I here make *Abrahams prayer* a sole meane of procreation? That I meane & affirme is, that by *Abrahams prayer* as a meane *Abimelech* his wyfe & women seruants, were made able to conceiue, which before they could not, not excluding, but including the knowlege and see'de of man: which no man in his right minde would hence gather, this couple excepted.

*oprad, 46,*

In his Doctrine pag. 2. he saith, it is absurd to affirme that the duell (being without a man) can dispose of the whole or any parte of mans bodie: but Detection, page 11. he saith that the duell (in all probability) did use *Sommers* his tongue, notwithstanding he was essentiallie and sensiblie playing boe peepe vnder the couerleed.

*Ans,*

The former proposition is not mine. I say every part, you saye, any part. And so by altering a word you haue made a contradiction where none is: except there be no other part of *Sommers* his body, besides his tongue.

And thus to thee Reader, but for breuitie. I would make it euident, that of the discourses fiftie contradictions being examined one by one, there is not so much as one to be found. The greater is their shame and shame who charged me with so many.

And here we are to obserue first, that of these contradictions there are about 20. wherein there is no contradiction at all, taking them at the hucksters hand, euen as the selues haue quoted them. And namely these: contradiction 4. 6. 7. 8. 13. 14. 17. 18. 19. 21. 23. 24. 26. 28. 31. 35. 38. 36. 37. 41. & 45.

Secondly, to marke the seuerall deuises or sleights whereby they make semblance of contradictions when there are in deed none if you take the words as they be set downe in my treatises. I hisse them as they make.

I By forging that I neuer affirmed (but often the contrary) as in contradiction 1. 9. 17. 19. 20. 23. 25. 26. 27. 35. & 46.

2 By omitting or detracting some worde or words material, as in contradiction 3. 11. 12. 25. 27. 30. 31. 33. 36. 39. & 40.

3 By adding, and thus haue they done in contradiction 5. 45. & 47.

By

4 By *altering*, 'as appeareth by contradiction 6, 17, 27, 29, 49

5 To this said end also, when both their contradictory propositions are in the same *page*, and sometimes in the very same sentence, they runne notwithstanding for the one of them to a *page* far off, or happellie to another booke: Hereby (I meane by alleaging two distinct pages of mine, somewhat also asunder) pretending, that what I say in one place, forgetting forsooth my self, I gaynsay in another. As appeareth by contradiction 1. 3. 5. 22. 26. 36. 42. & 47.

I hus haue these men so accustomed and taught themselves to falsifie my writings in whole or in part: by *forging*, *detracting*, *adding* & *altering*, as they haue alleaged very litle of mine truly: & no marvel: because truly alleaged they would not make for their purpose Yet notwithstanding they haue by these cursed meanes compassed their *contradictions*, I doubt not but that they please themselves greatly, and glory in them, specially in the great number of them, and doe thinke therein they haue shewed not a litle wit. But I wil tel you, a very foole that will giue libertie to himself to *adde*, *detract* and *alter* but here & there a letter, may easily make a thousand *contradictions*, where none are: much more he that will do thus by wordes & sometimes by sentences, as you haue done.

VWhether now you haue *pretermitted any thing material*, and by such *omitting*, and *taking what parte of my writings might make most for your purpose*, euen purposefully *maymed my writings*, which you deny and I affirme, iudge thou indifferently betwene vs good reader. And whether you will *acknowledge* and *redresse the offered wrong*, whereof I complaine, and which I trust to be a *wrong* I haue made manifest by this my *Replie*, vnto all men, & to your owne consciences, as you pretend you will, nay, seeme to abhorre not to do it, if once the *wrong* shal be made to appeare, saying: *God forbid that we should not doe it very willingly*: in time both thou and I shall know. And thus much for answer to their supposed *contradictions*. For breuitie sake I omit my reply to the *Absurdities* wherewith you charge me, and your slaunders contained in them.

Here not vnfitly may I charge you with the *contradictions* & *Absurdities* I find in your writings: and if it fall out so that your selues be found faultrie in that, wherof vnfitly you accuse another, then thereby learne henceforward to plucke rather the beame out of your own eyes, then busie your selues so much about lesse then a mote in your brothers eye.

Here follow their contradictions.

In their Answer page 55 and page 179 of their Discourses, they say, that the manifestation of Christ his deities, and declaration of his glorious Gospel, were the maine ends of possession: and a little after, that the possession of diuels were especially for these two ends: thereby insinuating that there were some other ends or end. Yet page 57 of the same booke they say, that these were the two only ends of this vocation full iudgement.

2 In their Dial. dis. page 58 they say, angels die eternall worke after an insensible, insensible, and spirituall manner. And the next leafe, page 60 they say, that angels in all their ambassages they do either manifest themselves by seeing and hearing, or assist vs eyesorens by some other sensible means. And they bring Augustine flatly affirming that the angels do outwardly helpe vs by certaine visible apparitions or sights, which they propose and offer before our eyes.

3 In their Discourses pa. 42 they say, the mind is selfe, and it only is that wherein motion coalesceth: and the body is but the minde's organ or instrument, hauing naturally in it selfe no motion at all, or no further motion at the most, then for those only actions where in the said mind (whose organ it is) employeth the same. But in pag. 74 of the same booke they affirme, that the body it selfe hath, and may accomplish or effect corporall operations and motions by it selfe alone, without any the direction, moderation, guidance, or consent of the soule.

4 In their Discourse pag. 116 they say, the diuell did bewitch and charme the Serpent, as that (through his craftie suggestion) hee was very wilable to propound such a diminution or sooth saying, as did presently enuincement or deceiue Euab. And in the same booke page 119 they say, that a reasonable speech cannot possibly be framed or understood of any but of a mind hauing understanding and reason.

5 In their Answer pa. 50 they say, These eight deminakers might be possessed, though the diuell was not essentially inherrent in any one of their bodies: But page 43 of the same booke they say, The possession of diuels whatsoever is ceased long since.

6 In their Discourses 173 they say, The Apostles might ambethically and much for infallible truth whatsoever they preached. But in their Answer page 126 128 129 130 they say, that the apostles sometime failed in doctrine. And a little after: all these were their errors in doctrine and iudgement. And againe. It was expedient for the apostles to erre in some things, that is, some points of doctrine. And thus they

understand after the holy Ghost fell vpon them, as is plaine by the  
aforesaid pages.

7 In their *Answer* pag. 7, they say, that wonders and miracles are  
flatly confounded: but in their *Dialogicall discourses* 259, they say, the  
diuel may worke wonders, but can effect no miracles. And pag. 310,  
thus, *A thing effected by essentiall means, howsoever it may be a won-  
der, yet no miracle in any respect.*

8 In your *Discourses* pag. 352. for your parts you assure me, that you  
are very farre from all suspicion of a precompacted confederacie betweene  
Somners and me. Yet in page 42. of your *Answer* you say, *Why should  
we wonder at all, that two cunning companions (Meaning Somners  
and my selfe) confederate together before, should conclude such a course  
betweene themselves, as the one (by the helpe of the other) should progre-  
ssicate strange and incredible enents.*

9 In pag. 39. of their *Discourses*, they tell vs, *There is not anie true  
sound Diuine that doth not vnderstand Possession as they doe, and none  
as I fondly imagine* and yet in the Epistle to the Reader prefixed  
before that booke, that which they deliuer concerning possession and  
dispossession of diuels, they call, *their private opinion*: and in page 195  
of their *Answer*, *The Lord his lately revealed counsels.*

*List of their absurd and vsound Positions*

- 1 God by good Angels may effect fantasticall, vaine, and filthie ef-  
fects. *Answer* 15.
- 2 Good Angels may effect vaine and filthie effects. *ibid.*
- 3 Vvheresoeuer the Scriptures speake of Angels or diuels, they  
speake only by metaphore. *ibid.*
- 4 The Diuel hath no desire to be in any mans body. *Ans.* 22
- 5 The Iewes in Christs time did (partly) know the parties which  
were possessed, from the often reuelation of the parties them-  
selves. *answ.* 32
- 6 God by his Spirit instructed the Cananitish woman (mentioned  
*Matth.* 15, 22) of her daughters malicie. *answ.* 33
- 7 The manifestation of Christs deitie, and the confirmation of the  
Gospell, the only ends of Possession. *answ.* 67
- 8 Christ hath put a finall end to the possession of diuels by his  
death and resurrection. *answ.* 66
- 9 The supernaturall actions or effects of the Diuel in Demoniaks,  
cannot possibly be comprehended by humane senses. *answ.* 69

10 The working of miracles was only in Christ and his Apostles  
dayes.

11 God hath appointed moving and lawing for a means of  
bounty or barrennes vpon the ground.

12 Good angels doe somtyme worke after an inuincible intention  
and spirituall manner. *Theological discourses* 18. This is not  
refuted by all those places where angels are said to haue appear-  
ed and spoken in visible manner to men.

13 The body hath a power to moue by it selfe alone, and  
porall actions and motions without the helpe of any  
moderation, *gurneys* and *Diad.* 19.

14 The dead carcasse of a man or the body being separate from  
the soule may and doth also effect corporall actions and motions.

15 The Diuel did so bewitch and so charme the Serpent, or that  
(through his craftie suggestion) there was very well able to pro-  
pound such a diuination as both they as did presently circum-  
uent and deceive *Ezech.* *Diad.* 14. 16. Absurd, that the Diuel  
should not only thus make the Serpent it selfe to speake, but  
also argue the matter like a reasonable creature.

16 The apostles erred in some points of doctrine, when the holy  
Ghost fell vpon them: Yea it was expedient for them to erre  
in some.

17 It is verie erroneous for any to imagine that the eyes may pos-  
sibly be deceived in discerning betweene spirits (that is, bodies  
assumed by spirits) and true naturall bodies. *Diad.* 19. 197. You  
forget that *Abraham* and *Lot* were deceived, as appeareth by *Gen.*  
18. and 19.

## FINIS

And to crade thy patience good Reader, specially the authors, for  
the late comming forth of this booke: for I confesse it hath layen  
in my hands almost this halfe yeare.



0 0094  
30032

REPRODUCED FROM THE COPY IN THE  
**HENRY E. HUNTINGTON LIBRARY**

FOR REFERENCE ONLY. NOT FOR REPRODUCTION

3

# THE REPLIE OF

JOHN DARRELL, TO THE AN-

SWER OF IOHN DEACON, AND

*John Walker*, concerning the doctrine of the  
Possession and Dispossession of  
Demoniakes.

Ecclesiastes 4. 1.

*I turned, and considered all the oppressions that are wrought under  
the sun, and behold, the tears of the oppressed, & none comforteth them:  
and for the strength is of the hand of them that oppress them, and none  
releaseth them.*



*London?*  
printed 1602.

6114

Job. 12. 31.

Genes. 9. 14.  
15.

pag. 68.

pag. 67.

pag. 69.

clude a small end of possession from the casting forth of the prince of this world. Here you increate it a thousand fold in making your owne singular, foolish, and impious wresting of this Scripture, to contain a matter of no lesse certaintie, then is the expresse word of God, for an utter end of any be like floud to that, which was in Noahs time. I do not tie the Lord to the punishment of Gomorrah, or of the children deriding the prophet, or of Gehaz, and such others: but where the like sinnes raigne, there may be the like punishment, which you will not grant it: a tuall Possession, having put a necessarie end vnto it. But you will not be pressed with *May be*. Much a do you keep with this Sophisme, a posse, ad esse. Whersoever you meet with *may or can* in the conclusion, then esdoones you tell vs of this fallacie. As in your *Discourses* your skil in Rhetorike, & in discerning of Tropes did faile you: so here it doth in Logicke, & in discerning *Elenchs*. I'ououch Possion of duels to bee infected also for sinne is Cucklike melodie in your eares, but you haue iung vs a lacke Dawes song in limiting it with *two onely ends*, that is, of confirmation of Christs Deity, and of the Gospell, as I haue abundantly proued.

Whereas I affirme the iudgement of our senses for the truth of *Sommers* vexation by Satan, you reply. Our senses could not comprehend such supernaturall matters: besides, they might be deluded, and diuells can do things in shew. For comprehension, seeing you deprive vs of all iudgement of sense, blame vs not if we be something dull in conceiuing this. How that seeing, we do not see: feeling, we do not fee: smelling, we do not smell: and hearing, we do not heare: and that we require you would make it plaine vnto vs. Which when you haue once done, and beaten into our heads, I will neuer trust mine eyes againe, though I should see *M. Deacon* in forme of an Angel of light. But if our senses were deluded, & things done in shew, that were not in deed, surely it was Satan that deluded vs, and no counterfeiting in *Sommers*, as you would faine haue it. This is the summe of your first dialogue against me, to which *Lycanthropus* subscribeth as ab'le to suffice any reasonable man: but this, is but a small thing, saith *Pucumatomachus*, and therefore he stretcheth the matter to an higher pitch. That neither any unreasonable man (which is much more) shall be euer able to answer it. So that now we are much beholding to *M. Deacon*, and *M. Walker*, that haue put all fooles and mad men to a perpetuall *non plus*, whose tongues would otherwise continually bee tamping.

Concerning the straunge and present affliction of the boy of Northwich,

Northwitch, I will say nothing : I neuer sawe him : howsoever you descant on the matter after your lying & paltry maner. Yet I think it not amisse to offer to thy view (good Reader) the iudgement of the Bishop of Chester in his direction to his parents, and of three other Commissioners for causes Ecclesiasticall, according with him therein.

pag. 71.

First we thinke it fit, and doe require the parents of the said childe, that they suffer not any to repaire to their house to visite him. saying such as are in authority, and other persons of speciall regard and knowne discretion, and to haue speciall care that the number alwayes be very smal. Further hauing seene the bodily affliction of the said child, and obserued in sundry fits vry strange effects and operations, either proceeding of naturall vñ. knowne causes, or of some diabolical practise. we thinke it conuenient and fit for the ease and deliuerance of the said childe from his grieuous afflictions, that prayer be made for him publicly by the minister of the parish, or any other preacher repairing thither, before the congregation so oft as the same assembleth. And that certaine preachers, namely, M. Garrad, M. Massey, M. Collier, M. Haruey, M. Eaton, M. Pierston and M. Brownhill. these onely and none other to repaire vnto the saide child by turnes, at their leisures will serue; and to vse their discretions by private prayer and fasting, for the ease and comfort of the afflicted: with all requiring them to abstaine from all solemn meetings, because the calamitie is particular, and the authoritie of the allowing and prescribing such meetings resteth neither in them nor in vs, but in our Superiours, whose pleasure it is fit we should expect. Moreover, because it is by some held that the child is really possessed of an vnleane spirit, for that there appeareth to vs no certaintie, nor yet any great probability thereof, wee thinke it also conuenient, and require the preachers aforesaid to forbear all formes of Exorcisme, which alwayes imply and presuppose a reall and actuall possession.

Rich. Cestriensis.

David Yale. Chancel.

Griff. Vaughan.

Hugh Burges.

Hereunto I will adde a fewe lines, which M. Haruey aforesaid, a man of great learning and godlines, writ in his life time to a friend of his.

Grace & mercie from our only Sauior. There is such a boy as your report signifieth,

signifieth, whose estate from the beginning of February till this present, hath beene so strange and extraordinary, in regard of his passions, behaviour, and speeches, as I for my part neuer heard, nor read of the like. Few that haue seene the variety of his fits, but they thinke the diuell hath the disposing of his body. My selfe haue diuers times seene him, and such things in him as are impossible to proceed from any humane creature. The matter hath affected our whole country. The Daimes with vs generally hold, that the child is really possessed. And so much for him.

pag. 76.

Rom. 12. 15.

Wee see what the Bishop and Preachers of Chesse-shire their judgement is touching this child. What say nowe the Discourser concerning him? They after they haue for three leaues together scoffed at his grievous affliction (for so the Bishop before tearemeth it) in most prophane, childish, and scurrolous manner, doe in the end affirme, that he counterfeith, and that tis would oone appeare, if he were well coniu'd a while with a three corded whip. Is this the fruit of your visiting the child? you had better haue kept you at home. Was this all the comfort the distressed boy and parents receiued from you? Miserable comforters then are you. Is this the mercy, and all the bowels of compassion that is in you, towards him that is in miserie? O mercilesse men, and voyd of all pitié! It appeareth you haue not learned to weepe, with them to whom we weep. Well, I can tell you of a couple of such merrie or mercilesse companions as your selves, that comming of late to one M. James Charles of Winfrith in Kent, to see his daughter Clemens Charles, who is reputed to be possessed with the diuell, & not without cause, they scarce went so merrily home, as they were at M. Charles, and yet but a small thing befell them by the way. Returning home, they went by one M. Hooke his house of Darton, maister not long before to this maid, at whose house she began to bee afflicted. Now as they were on horsebacke before M. Hooke his doore, and sporting themselves with him about the counterfeiting of this new vpstart counterfeiter, behold, one of their horses staled blood, and as they were talking thereof, loe, the other did the like: whereat they were somewhat appaull'd. How it fared with their horses after I know not, but the day following they caried themselves at M. Charles more soberly, whether they went on other horses. But hereof ynough: I will nowe proceede to your second Dialogue.

A

# A REPLIE TO THE SECOND DIALOGVE,

THE second part of my *Doctrine* treateth, That those eight before mentioned were verily dispossessed, & that by fasting and prayer, the meanes appointed by God. For confirmation whereof, I knew no better rule then the example of men dispossessed in holy Scripture, which is the onely true and unfallible touchstone to examine both this, and all other actions by. These *Answers* scorne these notes, calling them *falsly pretended signes of dispossession from sacred Scripture*, and therefore premitting them, require my argumentes, as if the Signes from Scripture were no arguments at all. It seemeth you haue found a veine of better mettall then the Scriptures, frō whence your whole booke is so full stuffed with your owne shining dross, and is so vtterly destitute of this purified gold. Yet you cannot beat me from them, but I vrge them thus: *There were in our Demoniacs the selfe same signes or notes of dispossession, precedent and subsequent, which wee reade of in the Scripture Demoniacs, and therefore the same dispossession: you answer, There were not the same signes in our demoniacs: and first, because they were meere cosonages, as is confessed freely by the parties themselves upon their owne oathes.* I reply, the parties, we speake of, bee eight in number, whereof onely *Sommers* hath made this cursed confession: which was not free and voluntarie, as you vntruly affirme, but extorted by Satan, and his instruments, as in my *Detection* I haue made manifest. But what say you to the seuen in *Lancashire*? It may be *Sommers* hath sworne for the all: for they as yet, were neuer examined: yet because we doubt of *Sommers* general oath, I pray you proue vnto vs, who taught the children to counterfeit? when, and where, and by what meanes they were taught? what end might induce them to imbrace such teaching? whether the parents were priuy to it? and what they propounded in practising such wickednesse? Yea, put *Sommers* too in to the roll, & shew vs what man is able by practise to do the things that either *Sommers* or they did? And one woulde thinke a man of meane agility might quickly performe that, which cosoning yong boyes and girles could. Shew vs, I beseech you, these and such like things, or otherwise if you cannot shew the, & yet tel vs of *cosnage*, you shew vs nothing but your long eares, & brassen faces. Secondly,

pag. 82.

Detection. pag.  
127.



pag. 83.

Doff. pag. 37

say you, *The signes in the Scripture Demoniakes were sensibly perceived by the beholders: but these in your pretended Demoniakes were not so, by your own confession.* Belike all we that were spectators of our Demoniakes, being (at sundrie times) a great multitude, were all stricken with blindness, with deafnesse, and with a benumbednes, and yet we all thought we used our senses, and I am sure, wee were no sooner out of the place, but we were able, the Lord bee thanked, to see, heare, and feele. But you confirme this by *mine own confession*, which saith, that *the spirit could not possibly be felt or seene.* I said so, & say so againe, that Spirits cannot be felt or seene in their owne bare essence, but as they make themselves knowne vnto vs by their effects. Iangling Sophisters will dispute, That the nose of a mans face cannot be seene, because that which we see is but colour or forme, and the nose it selfe is neither of both. Your eares ring it may bee with their noise, which hath made you borrow an argument from them. Thirdly, you say, *The Signes we report are false:* which I would graunt you, if your selues had learned to speake truth. We must remember there are about two hundred witnesses hereof living at this day, of which some haue deposed the same wee report of *Somers.* Fourthly, say you, *Scripture Signes can argue no Dispossession now, because like effects may arise from naturall causes, and corporall diseases.* By this your good helpe Atheists might ouerthrow all Possessions and Dispossessions in the scripture. But howsoever you may be friendly to such vile wretches, yet haue they no foothold from hence. For neither those effects in those ancient Demoniakes, nor in these of our time jointly & wholly considered can proceed from naturall disease. Naturall causes can bring forth no supernaturall effects, as we haue demonstrated these to be in spite of your *seuenth Dialogue*, and what other treaty soeuer you oppose against it. Lastly, say you, *A dispossession may bee without such apparant signes, and therefore your signes precedent and subsequent do not necessarily conclude a dispossession.* What? Because it is sometimes without these signes, therefore where these signes are, shall it not be? It is sometime day light without the cleare sunshine, therefore when the Sunne shines cleare shall it not be day? Sometimes the murderer slayes a man and is not taken with the manner, therefore if he be taken with the manner, shall he not necessarily bee concluded a murtherer? These are good rules to make a man impudent in sinne: for by them the bold offender shall speede better, then hee that doth it mincingly. You haue spoken then pretily against these signes, but without any

signo

signe of truth or wit.

From Scripture signes I descend to some experimented by my selfe in dealing with Demoniakes, which have reported certaine visible shapes, in which the diuels seemed to depart from them. But here I am taken vp for halting, in that I call it *My experience, which was proued in the persons of other.* I confesse I spake rudely, as all other men do, which call a physition a man of good experience, though he hath not proued all the diseases, he hath dealt with, in his owne body. As for *visible shapes, you vtterly deny, that Spirits could procure the:* yet they did before *Pharao*s, and infinite others since, as wee haue shewed by better arguments in my suruey of your fourth and fift Dialogues, then you euer haue, or can for the contrarie. Some also I shew did *vomit*, or straine to vomit when the diuel departed. With this you make good sport, perhaps tied with remembrance, that you haue returned to your owne vomit. pag. 84.

Further, I concluding a dispossession, from the present effect of our prayers (wherof the like is not in naturall diseases.) You charge me with *proper termes, as with certaine charming words to conuince the Lord with,* for so it pleaseth your prophane mouthes to speake: And yet I do not vse the word *proper.* Onely I say, *And God heard our prayer vttered in such termes,* that is, made to that effect, as before I haue shewed in brieve. I neuer dreamed, that such Argooles would come after mee with so manie eyes, to finde an hole in my coate for these words more thē in all other mens. But to let words passe, you would disprove the effect of our prayers, for that we could not make the parties *the Temples of the holy Ghost,* as we had prayed. Wee challenge no such power, but we might well hope of the mercy of the Lord to sanctifie them, which did plainly behold his great goodnesse in deliuering them from Satans great rage. Howsoeuer mee thinks you should not be offended with vs for putting vp this request to God. And what if the Lord doth not alwayes yeelde present successe to the prayers of his seruants? Could we not therefore be assured he had now heard vs, when we saw the thing performed before our eyes? It is true the Diuel sometime seemeth to depart, when he doth not but when it is at the requests of Gods people: when it is after such grievous vexation as was in the Demoniakes in the Gospell, when it is with the health of the parties, and present free'ome from all former vexations dy Satan, wee need not doubt of it in any sort. For the visible departure of Satan, I answered you euen very now. pag. 85.

Besides,

pag. 87. 88.  
89.

Matt. 12. 43

Matt. 12. 45

Besides, I aileage for Dispossession, *Satans desire of repossessing, which is neuer but after he is throwne out.* You returne a double answer, first; that these wordes, *I will returne to the house from whence I came, &c.* be metaphoricall. Wee remember indeede your monstrous absurditie in making all things whatsoeuer, spoken of, *Angels, and diuels in the scripture, to be* Metaphoricall. But as I haue shewed you, manie are not Metaphoricall, so neither is this respecting the sentence of it. The words be part of a similitude, as is plaine by the reddition, *So shall it be to this wicked generation.* The whole Randeth thus. As when an vncleane spirit goeth forth of a man, passeth through drie places seeking rest, and findeth none: then saith, *I will returne to my house, &c.* entering againe in, the last estate of that man is worse then the first, so shal it be to this wicked generatio. Now to find what part of this sentence is Metaphoricall, we are to know that a similitude is twofold. One which is contracted & shut vp in one word, properly called a Metaphor; the other displaid & spread open, consisting of all the parts at large, and is tearmed by the name of the generall, a Similitude. For the figuratiue part in either, the reason is one in both. Therefore as in a contracted similitude, the Metaphor lyeth in the word that is borrowed, and not in that from whence it is borrowe'd, so in the larger similitude, the metaphoricall part of it resteth in the Reddition, not in the Proposition. For example, Honour nourisheth Artes; the word Nourisheth being borrowed from meats nourishing the bodie, is a Metaphor as it is applied to Honour, and Artes, but attributed to his proper termes, it is no Metaphor, as to say thus, Meat nourisheth the body. In like manner (to make a full Similitude of it, in this sort) As meat nourisheth the body, so Honour nourisheth Artes, the Metaphoricall part of the whole, lyeth in the latter member, not in the first. So likewise when our Sauour saith, As a man deliuered from the possession of Satan, and receiuing him in againe, is in worse case after, then before: So the nation of the Iewes, once deliuered from the kingdome of Satan, so long as the church of God was amongst them, and comming into his subiection againe by refusing Christ, should bee in more miserable condition then, in any former time: the Metaphoricall sentence of this Similitude, is in the last branch of it, not in the first. Not because there be no Metaphoricall words in the first, as Drie places, house emptie, swept, garnished. &c. but for that wee now speake of Metaphoricall sentences, not of words. I frame my argument from the Proposition of the Similitude, the sentence where-

of is literall and historicall, not from the Reddition, whose sense is allegoricall. Now then it a man should reason thus: The Reddition of the Similitude is Metaphoricall, therefore the whole is metaphoricall, it is all one as if one should say, The blacke Moore hath white teeth, therefore he is all white. Which kinde of argument euerie chimney-sweeper would deride: and yet thus you reason from this place, and make it one of your chiefest props to vpholde your absurd conclusions with. But vnto this place I added another, where our Sauour saith to the vncleane spirit, *Come out of him, and enter no more into him.* Was our Sauours prohibition here in vaine? was this caution altogether needlesse and superfluous? How chauce you pass ouer this place, without answerig one word vnto it? It was too plaine: and you two could not agree where the Metaphor should lie, & therefore thought better to slip it ouer, then by handling it, and bewraying your owne absurdities, to marre all. The re-entrie therfore of Satan is plaine by the Scriptures: so that we need not the testimonie of any experience: yet I haue adioyned in the *Doctrine* the report of the children dispossessed, and the euidence of many godly then present, which perceiued by their agonie, and the words of their resistance, what Satan attempted. You trifle ouer this with greater childishnesse then appeared in the childrē, though but nine or tenne yeares old, and therefore I disdain to answer it. Again for prooofe of dispossession, I alleage the continuance of the parties health since: you answer: *Their former fittes were but counterfeited, as themselves haue confessed.* A stale prooofe of their counterfeiting, and answered before. The seuen in Lancashire neuer confessed any counterfeiting.

Mar. 9. 25.

pag. 90.

pag. 91. 92.

93.

Thus haing confirmed Dispossession, I remove that vsuall objection, shewing it is now no miracle, for that it is not done by absolute power of Christ in bodily presence, as he sometimes did it when he was here conuersant on earth, nor by any committed extraordinary power to men, but by fasting and prayer as the means, you answer first: *as if I affirmed Christs absolute power to be ceased:* which I affirme not, but account such affirmation blasphemie. He is not now present in bodie on earth, but worketh by his absolute authoritie still. Secondly, *if Christs absolute authority be the only efficient, then the worke is as miraculous, as euer.* Which is a flat vntruth, as I haue proued at large in your tenth Dialogue. For works done by men as instruments are distinguished by the maner of working, and not by the principall cause. you say my Similitude from the

*Queene, and Lord Chawncellor* is too absurd: for first, it is a case which never shall be, and so cannot illustrate. I had thought that *this similitude* might haue had some force. But surely as you are full of newe Diuinitie, so I thinke you haue swallowed *disagantain Philosophie*, you breake out on euerie occasion with such wonderfull new axiomes of Logicke. I intended that *Similitude* to the manner onely of Christs working, and you would extend it to the *like glory of his works now*, cleane beyond my purpose, and any good probabilitie. For are not Christs workes more glorious, when together with him selfe his seruants worke extraordinarily, as they did in the time of miracles, then now, when his seruants working is only ordinarie. But you will make the same similitude ouerthrow all miracles now, which I will yeeld for any, but for your selues: for you haue a priuiledge to do miracles, as is apparant in your tenth Dialogue.

Pag. 94.

Matt. 17. 21

Deut. 29. 29

Pag. 95. 96.

Matt. 17. 21

Math. 7. 17.

Hitherto for *Dispossession*, now for the *meanes*: which I affirme with many godly and learned of auncient and our owne times, to be *fasting and prayer*, out of the words of our Sauour, *This kinde goeth not out but by fasting and prayer*. Were I calling it a *Secret ordinance*, oppose it to more euident places: you catch at the word, and come vpon me with *Secret things belong only to God*. He that should deale with you had neede, as the Lawyers in writing their instruments, rather haue twentie words to spare, then to want one. You would proue, *these words did onely belong to the Disciples, because the question was made by them, and the answer to them*. The layser in the 16. of the *Acts* sayd to Paul and Silas, *What must I do to be saved?* They answer him: *Believe in the Lord Iesus Christ and thou shalt be saved*, &c Doth this Scripture now only belong to the layser, because this question was made by him, & the answer vnto him? Of this kind be infinite other places For interpretation of these words of Saint Matthew, I haue shewed you how I conceiue of them in your ninth Dialogue. Which exposition varieth somewhat from my former, not because I cannot maintaine it against any thing you object, but because I seeke after truth, and not after vaine iangling. If you can shew me any better, I will be readie also to change this. In meane season vnderstand how I reason from hence for the perpetual meanes of fasting and prayer, which are mentioned by our Sauour, in this place, either as helpe to the extraordinarie and miraculous faith of the Apostles, or else of the ordinarie. But they are not mentioned as helpe to the extraordinarie: for miraculous faith in the least quantity, though no more then a graine of mustard seede

## THE 2. DIALOGVE.

was able without these helpes to expell any diuell. Besides they could not be helpes to that, which in it selfe had no being. For the Disciples had vtterly lost their miraculous faith, else they had eiected the spirit. This also the word *Apistia*. incredulity doth note vn to vs. And an helpe is a conioyned force, which coniunction cannot be, where there is nothing to ioine withall: and therefore they bee propounded in this place as helpes to the ordinary faith, and so to haue a perpetuall ordinarie vse, when like occasion is ministred to vs. Againe, euery Exception is a compendious speech, comprehending in it two propositions, as, *Except a man be borne againe, he cannot see the kingdome of God*: wherein is concluded also this, If a man be borne againe he can see the kingdome of God. So, *None can come vnto me except the Father draw him*. Euery one can come vnto mee, whom my Father draweth. Againe, *Except th<sup>se</sup> abide in the ship, you cannot be sau'd*. If these abide in the ship, you can be sau'd. And so in all other. In like manner, *This kind doth not go forth, but by prayer and fasting*. This kind doth go forth by prayer and fasting. Now the let men of iudgement determine whether here be not an euident confirmation of the ordinarie course of the Church in dealing after this maner: and whether it be not exceeding boldnesse, our Sauour affirming in such sort as is declared. That this kind doth goe forth by prayer and fasting, for any to open his mouth licenciously agaist it, and to disgrace it by al opprobrious tearmes he can. From hence too you may see, the similitude drawne from the Physitian saying to his patient, daungerously sicke of the Pleurisy, *You cannot live, except you bleeca*, was to good purpose, if you could iudge what is to purpose.

It is too tedious to repeat all your vntruthes, your absurd Non sequiturs, and idle profes. As if it ought it vnrasonable for Christ to reprove his Disciples negligence: if Christs answer were not proper to the Disciples, it was no answer: if he directed not his speech to the Disciples onely, he spake to no body present. This mettall craues no touchstonne, it shewes it selfe by the eye what it is: therefore a knocke with an hammer is sufficient. So, *If this answer of Christ propounded an ordinance for al ages to come, there is an ordinance without an appointed subject to vndergo the same*. Indeed this would be straunge for Accidents to walke alone without subiects. It is a difficult matter to finde who should be the subiect of fasting and prayer: so likewise too of the kingdom of God, which our Sauour ordaineth to be sought in the first place, and food and rayment in the second, if we could tell who should

*Ioh. 3.3.*

*Ioh. 6.44.*

*Act. 27. 31*

*pag. 99*

*Matt. 6.*



pag. 100.

should do it. Besides, *succeeding ages* that could expell this cumbersome diuel, should haue more power then euer the Apostles had, which is fallie: for the Apostles, their faith not fayling, could expell any diuell. Further, *The Apostles* should faile in not declaring this ordinance vnto vs: concerning which ynough hath beene saide in the ninth Dialogue. Lastly, it is no established ordinance in this place, because *M. Darrell* affirmeth, it hath beene an ordinance from the beginning. I answer, I doe not referre the originall to this place, but onely the Confirmation, no otherwise, then I make Matrimony an established ordinance by our Sauour Christ, he renewing the institution of it.

Math. 19. 99

math. 12. 27

Act. 16. 13.

Againe. I argue the meanes of fasting and prayer from the example of the Iewes Church in our Sauours time: wherein some did cast forth diuels, and yet were not in the number of our Sauours Disciples, neither did it in his name. You answer, *I contrarie my selfe, affirming else where, they did it by the finger of God*: I reply, you do not contrary your selfe, but are euer like your selues, most absurdly concluding the selfe same working of the instrument, from the same maner of the principall agent: whereas the chiefe doer being the same, may and doth worke by the instrument diuersly.

pag. 101.

Againe, say you, *by mine owne confession, this ordinance as then was not established*. I answer, it was not so plainly, as when our sauour confirmed it by these words, yet in generall it was, and practised in the Church before. Moreouer, say you, *Those in our Sauours time besides his Disciples cast out diuels by miraculous faith only*, for which you alleage the seuenth of *Matthew*. I reply, this scripture speaketh onely of the eiection of Satan, but sheweth not in what manner the same was performed, nor when. We do not leane vpon any doubtfull uncertainties, as you would Rhetorically declame, if ye knew how: neither do we take the Lords holy name in vaine, nor pray without faith: as you prate both without wit and conscience. I passe ouer your fooleries concerning K. Wright, & your sixe lies at one clap, contained in seuen lines, as I can proue to your shame. But what speake I of sixe, when I dare say there be sixe hundred leafings in your two volumes? VVe neede not take things of whole sale men by retale: it is an easy matter to know by your lying whose children ye are.

pag. 103.

pag. 104.

That *Christs speech* ought not to be appropriated to the Disciples, hath beene declared. Neither do I say and vsay, as you falsely charge me. The communication was betweene our Sauour and his Disciples, but the ordinance there mentioned is common to all: yet *Physiologi* to fit these variable answers, as hee miscals them, doth tell vs

pag. 105.

106.

tale of an Hermit, which coming to a Farmers house, and blowing his  
 fingers to warm them, and his postage to cold them, was so packing by  
 the Farmer, as a dissembling companion. Let us require you to tale what  
 if the like Hermit had come to some good mans house, and ha-  
 ving on his face a faire shining visage with a written vpon it,  
 the use vpon occasion haue his visage shewen off, and shew  
 shew another face, lined with 7. De. Might not the good man  
 justly at this horrible face, and such kind of countenance, as honest com-  
 panie to be ware of him? I will pardon you yet for a fast and pag. 107.  
 loose for a stilling, though I might iustly make it sit faster vnto you,  
 then you would vntoote againe in halfe. Put where is the contra-  
 dictie, I pray you, in making these words to be spoken to the Disciples, and  
 yet not onely to be vnderstood of them? You would collect it after this  
 manner, Because that weaknesse of faith, and the kind of spirit were the  
 two impediments, wherefore the child was not deliuered. And that which  
 is an impediment to anie, is also proper to the same partie, if we will  
 beleene your Metaphysicks. For you must needs deriue your As- Heb 3. 19.  
 sumption from hence. As if the Israelites being shut out of the land G 4. 1. e.  
 of promise for their vbeleefe, this impediment should bee so pro-  
 per to them, that none but themselves should be excluded for the  
 same; which absurditie is of that nature, that if your stick of fast  
 and loose were a good sound cudgell, you deserue to be well labou-  
 red about the shoulders with it. But what should I pursue your se-  
 uerall absurdities? To talke after such scatterers were to fill a cart,  
 rather then ones lap. In briefe for your whole dispute, to proue these  
 words onely to belong to the Disciples: If incredulitie and omission of  
 prayer and fasting were impediments onely to the nine Disciples, Matt. 17. 1.  
 (for Peter, James and Iohn were not of this number) then they can  
 be impediments to no body else. And so Peter, James & Iohn should  
 cast out any kind of spirit notwithstanding the like incredulity, and  
 omission of fasting and prayer. Yea all other Christians whatsoever  
 should also in like manner. For what should hinder them, if they  
 haue no impediment? And what impediment can they haue, these  
 two being onely proper to the nine Disciples? See now how pro-  
 uidently you tie these words to the Disciples onely, permitting larger  
 power to all other Christians then to them. The contradiction you  
 here charge me with is lame. It is palpably false, that I pag 42. of the  
 Doctrine auouch, there are some kind of spirits, which the Apostles (with  
 all their power) could not possibly expell, but by prayer and fasting. Of  
 this very error I do by sundrie reasons from pag. 44. of the Doc-  
 trine,

trine, vnto page 48. confute Stapleton and Thyrens, which notwithstanding you charge vpon me, & againe sticke not to say, that Stapleton, Thyrens and my selfe agree herein, so shamelesse are you. But specially you make your selues merie with a contradiction, pag. 111. 112. I answer, The Disciples their not expelling the diuell out of the Lunatike, when they were destitute of miraculous faith, letteth not but that by miraculous faith they could expell any diuel. These I trust may agree together, without cutting the throat one of another.

pa. 113, &c.  
That which you talke of helping their weak miraculous faith by fasting and prayer, is already answered. Further, I shewing that fasting and prayer were not required as helpes in this place to miraculous faith, say, that Miraculous faith is of that kind, which is given without means to certaine men: whereupon it must needs follow, that there being an Apistia, an vtter defect of miraculous faith in these Disciples, it was not to be recovered by fasting and prayer. You answer, It was not begotten without means, because it was given by inspiration of God.

1. Cor. 12, 9.

pag. 114.

By which you make the holy Spirit to bee a meanes: whereas a meanes is but an instrument: And the holie Ghost together with the other two persons of holie Trinity is alwayes a principall efficient. Thus you confound heaven and earth together, & make nothing in the world to be done without means: neither any thing in the world to bee more then ordinary: for whatsoeuer is done by the same vsuall and neuer ceasing meanes, must needs bee reputed ordinarie. There be few places in the fildie more replenished in the spring with stincking nettles and weedes, then your whole booke with such poyson full Hemlockes as these. But with all we haue a Discourse of an Habituall & Actuall miraculous faith: whereof the habitual is begotten by the Spirit and the word. Seeing therefore these causes cannot alwayes be effectlesse, and that they be euer working in the Church till the end of the world, it cannot be avoided but that Miraculous faith should be in the Church for euer: And the rather if we consider, what by your saying miraculous faith is: which you define to be nothing els, but an *ind. need perswasion*, by which we firmly beleue, that there is nothing impossible to God: But all the faithfull do vndoubtly beleue this, and therefore we haue still Miraculous faith remaining amongst vs, and shal haue so long as the Church sojournes on earth: yea the very diuels beleue this and so hauing miraculous faith, by your leaden rule shall bee workers of true miracles, I adde, they which were endued with the mira-

miraculous faith, had besides the perswasion of Gods omnipotencie, an vndoubted perswasion of the will of God, for the effecting of the wonderful matters, which besides or contrarie to nature they attempted for the good of the Church. Now for as much as the *knowledge and assurance of the said will of God* is not to bee had from the word, therefore the written word is not the onely ground-worke of miraculous faith, neither doth it come by the *hearing thereof*, as you affirme. For *Actuall faith*, you will haue it a *speciall motion from the spn it of God, raised vp extraordinarily*, whereby the action of faith shall not proceed from the *Habit* as from the next cause, as the action of iustice cometh from the habit of iustice, and so in all other qualities of that kind, but there shall be something in *Actuall faith* extraordinarily more then was in the *Habituall*. If a man had your sharpnes he might quickly go beyond *Actius Nauis*, that cut the whetstone in peeces with his rasor. For the *increase of miraculous faith by means*, it is but needles to stand vpon it, considering we affirm an vtter defect thereof at this time in the disciples, not some couered sparkes remaining in them, to be raised into flames by fasting and prayer. For true miraculous faith how little soeuer, is able with out these helps, to atchiue her defined worke. But then you will say, yea in effect do say, that the *Apostles did superfluously ioine prayer with it*. I answer, no more superfluously, then the Church doth ioine Sacraments with the word. Faith of it self is sufficient, to apprehend Christ vnto saluation, and this faith is begotten by the word: Yet Sacraments haue their necessary vse, not to inable faith to that, which it could not with out them, but to confirme and strengthen it to doe her worke more chierfully, and with fuller assurance. Prayer is the generall instrument to be vsed in all holy workes, what soeuer: and therefore the Apostles had warrant for their prayer, & were free from all will-worship therein. I omit here for breuitie siue of your slanders, and two contradictions where-with you charge me, my selfe being not author of any one of the contradictory propositions.

I prouing that these wordes in S. Mathewe (*this kind goeth not out, &c.*) belong not peculiarly to the Disciples, say, that if our Saviour had rebuked them for not fasting & praying, they might haue excused their want of time, you trifle exceedinglye about this: at last you afford vs this worthy answer, that *considering our Saviours staying in the mount* (which for all the circumstances you can alleadge can not be long) *they had time yett to pray*. *Antiquum obtinet Criso,*  
you

pag. 116.

pag. 117. 118

Matt. 17. 21

pag. 119

120. 121.

pag. 122.

p. 123. 124

p. 5.

pag. 125.

you must run your old byas, & impudently Ap'vs in the mouth with time for prayer, while the question is of time for fasting and prayer. Againe, you wil haue these words, *This kind goeth not forth but by fasting and prayer, to be no severall reason required by you.* Sam. vii. 30. Disciples failed in their purpose: whereas we haue shewed, it is a distinct thing from Miraculous faith, and not necessarily ioyned with it: and therefore not to concurre in making one reason with the same. Moreover say I, if the Apostles in each weakness of this faith, much of necessity haue betaken themselves to fasting and prayer, they should haue bene a whole day about a miracle: the exercise of fasting requiring this space, which would haue bene great hindrance to their speedy travel our the whole earth. You answer, *This is Iudaisme.* Beside also it is Iudaisme for Christians to pray, because the Iewes did so. But vnderstand good Reader, that the practise only of such ceremonies as the Lord appointed to be a difference betweene the Iewes and other people, is Iudaisme, not the exercise of such duties, as be common to both. That which you doubt what should become of the other part of the day, if the diuell should be cast forth before none, becometh men which acknowledge no other seruice of God, but for their owne turnes. Is there no duty of thanksgiving? no request for strength to the party dispossessed? no desire that the eye-witnesses might profit by it? you would haue Christians serue God, as the dog his maister for a bone. The rest is vnworthy to be repeated. & so was this, but that I would giue the Reader a taste. But what say you, that wil not haue a fast to continue for a day, to A. Walker, alias Io. Deacon: who in a booke of his called the Footpath to fasting, saith, that in the day of our fast, we must be exercised in hearing, applying, and praying for the removing of God his iudgements, euen from morning to night? Do I (you false tongues) in pag. 48. and 49. of the Doctrine say, that the Apostles should haue stirred vp their weak faith, by fasting and prayer, when I spend those whole pages to proue the contrary? O palpable slander, and extreame impudencie! Likewise you say, I affirme else where, *The Apostles faith was so strong as it needed no meanes to stirr vp the same.* And I would tell you, you say vntruly, but that your skore is so full that now you be desperate. Of these two bastardy propositions, conceived and brought forth by your selues, and not by me, you frame a Contradiction: saying therupon, that I will turne, ere I burne, yea with the turning of an hand, turne the cat in the pan: and then you tell my pupils, they may be pestilent proud of

of such a turne about. Here wee may beholde as your honest dealing with me, so your eloquence and modestie.

Belides, I auouching the Apostles strong faith after Pentecost, able for miracles: what forer, and therefore unlikely the Lord should appoint a peculiar course for them, for so short a time as from his transfiguration till then: you collect from hence the weaknes of their faith till Pentecost: which I graunt you, and more then that, namely, that their miraculous faith was vtterly extinct at this time. And therefore no vse of fasting and prayer for the extraordinarie work, but onely as it serued to the vsual manner of the Church in this case. But you will proue the apostles miraculous faith might faile after Pentecost, because their faith failed sometimes in doctrine and iudgement. That we may vnderstand your meaning, what do you signifie by Doctrine? what by iudgement? Doctrine vsually is publike teaching and instruction: Iudgement priuate thinking and opinion. Did the Apostles erre in publike teaching? You saye, *The Apostles and bretheren which were in Iudea*, thought the word of God was not to be preached to the Gentils. You ground this out of these wordes. And when Peter was ascended to Hierusalem, they of the circumcision contended against him. VWho contended with him? The Apostles, say you, but without any warrant from the text. It seemeth S. Luke hauing mentioned the Apostles in the first verse doth of purpose in the second vse these generall termes, *They of the circumcision*, to distinguish these contenders with Peter, fro the Apostles. It may be the Apostles did not yet so clearly vnderstand this mistery, yet it is not likelie they were in this case no more but equal to the weake bretheren, whereby they should ioyne in contention with them. Grant we also an errour here, it was only in iudgement, not in doctrine. And as for Peters not going rightly to the truth of the Gospell, it was not error either in doctrine or iudgement, but a timorous dissimulation for the time. Iohn his falling downe before an Angell, was errour through sodaine passion, not proceeding from setled iudgement, much lesse auouched in publike teaching. Considering therefore these places proue not that the Apostles erred in doctrine and iudgement, and that the Lord doth principally promise, that the Spirit of truth should lead them into all truth: and bring all things to their remembrance which Christ had told them, whereupon they be called Skillfull Maister-builders, and the Church is said to be built vpon the foundation of the prophets and apostles. It is admirable you dare so confidently auouch such an assertion, vpon so little or rather no warrant, and of so dany

Mat. 11. 2.

Gal. 2. 13. 14

Reue. 19. 10

Ioh. 16. 13. 14

& 14. 26.

1. Cor. 3. 10.

Ephes. 2. 20.



gerous consequence; You childishly caull at my speech, where I say, *Their faith did not faile them, after they received the holy Ghost in That fulnesse*: as if I had attributed such a fulnesse to the as is not incident to a creature: and yet I expressely distinguish it by note of restraint *That fulnesse*, that is, such a plenuifull measure as I had spoken of before. Such an one, as was said of *Stephen* that *hee was full of the holy Ghost*: and of *Paul*; and of *Elizabeth*; when these brake forth into that heavenly salutation: of the blessed virgin, *that she was filled with the holy ghost*. The same is said of *Zachary* when he prophesied, and of the Apostles, *that they were filled with the holy ghost*. And all these in the Concret. but in the Abstract without all limitation to haue the fulnesse of the Spirit, belongeth onely to a diuine person, the Father, the Sonne, and the holy Ghost. So that whatsoever person hath the simple fulnesse of the Spirit, the same is God, as well as hee who hath the fulnesse of the Godhead. Of Christ his fulnesse (to whom the Father hath not giuen his Spirit by measure) do all the elect receiue, nor the fulnesse it selfe, but grace, for grace, that is, graces or gifts of the Spirit heaped vpon graces: euery one according to the measure of the gift of Christ, some euē vntill their cup runne ouer. All which discourse when at last you conclude, that *howsoeuer the Apostles were subiects to errour, yet they could not possiblie erre so long as they he and the voice of Christ*: and but followed the onely directions of the spirit of truth: And that they did neuer vniuersally erre: Moreover, that they did neuer decline from the foundation it selfe: & lastly, that they were recalled from their errors: what singular thing do you ascribe to the Apostles, that is not common to all beleeuers? Are not the Apostles to be preferred aboue all other Ministers of the Gospell, and beleeuers since their dayes? Yet you seeme to put them in the very same ranke. Nay, you say in the top of the same page, that *there be some Testimonies of the Apostles, which onely but slipped from humane infirmities, and that these (how glorious soeuer in (beu) are not the testimony of Iesus, & therefore not the spirit of prophesie*. you speake here very daungerously, that I say no worde.

You argue the defect of the Apostles miraculous faith, from their praying in working miracles, which rather is an argument for the continuance of it. For if it had bin vtterly extinct, it had not bene to be obtained by prayer. but if you say Prayer declarerh the weaknes of it, and that you meane such weaknesse, as without prayer had not bene able to effect the worke; it is false, as hath bene oft remembred

pag. 127. Cc

AB. 7. 55. &

13. 9.

Luc. 1. 41.

Act. 2. 2. 4

pag. 133.

pag. 135.

AB. 4. 29

30. & 9. 40

& 28. 8

vnto you: but if you take weaknesse for some lesse measure of cheerefullnesse, which had neede be stirred by invocation of Gods holy name, I graunt you such a weaknesse. but this is too weake to strengthen any whit your cause. you charge mee fally in saying, I denie that the apostles saith might *could* saile before they were filled with the holy Spirit. I know not how oft I affirme this, which you say is the very point I denie. Neither do I say, it was but *some* dayes betweene Christ his transfiguration, and Pentecost. I do wittingly let passe manie of your lies: it is a trouble to repeate them, you see no inconuenience to appropriate these words. This kind goeth not forth but by fasting & prayer, to the Disciples themselves: whereas if fasting and prayer had bene necessarie as helpes to their weake faith, that could not stand which our Sauour hath immediately before affirmed, that so much faith as a graine of Mustard seede should be able to do the greatest miracles. Howe this distinction of diuels is to be vnderstood, we haue sufficiently declared in the Doctrine. you make a wonderful partition, when you interpret *This kind*, only to distinguish diuels from other creatures. The nature of a partition is, that the thing which is parted should be common to all the members. as in this place, creatures going out is the Generall agreeing to both the Specials, in this sort. Of creatures that goe out of man some are diuels, and they go not out but by fasting and prayer: some are of other kinde, and these of what nature soeuer goe out of a man without fasting and prayer. What, is man now become a cage for all creatures? Indeed the old Philosophers had woont to say, that Man is a little world: but you will giue vs a sensible vnderstanding of it, if horses, beares and Lyons, fowles, and creeping things of all kind, may haue an habitation in him. You haue bene so carefull all this while to free man from possession of diuels, that in the meane season you haue made him a forrest to containe all sauage beasts in. I pray you what kind of creature doth lodge in your owne breastes? But you say, *This kind* cannot be referred to the diuels, amongst themselves, because they be all of one kind as angels be, and all men. Profoundly sure as if kind did onely note essence, and not sometimes quality and condition. you brought vs euen now an example of *shrewes*. The best of this kind is shrewish ynough whereby you said, women were seuered from men by their sexe or kind. Is difference of sexe difference of Essence? So we speake of deceitfull men, This kind of men is not to bee trusted: of flatterers and ambitious persons, This kind of men speake all to please those in authority: of such as haue made shipwracke of

Doct. pag. 42

46.48

Doct. 49

pag. 136

Doct. p. 512

pag. 137

a good conscience, This kind of men groweth worse & worse. Now tell me, you *Answerers*, whether *Kind* will carie no other sense but that wherewith you caull as belcemieth fresh *Sophisters*. Again, it is admirable, you could find no other similitude to declare the distinction of diuels by, but onely the whole state of this kingdom of England, comparing our most gracious *Soueraigne*, Gods Lieutenante amongst vs (I tremble to speake it) to the Prince of darknesse, and all the inferiour honourable orders of *Dukes, Earles, Lords, Iudges, Iustices, Knights, Gentlemen, yomen, &c.* to the lower sort of diuels. Could any men forget themselves so much, as that against all good maners, against honesty, against Christianitie, yea, against nature it selfe, which hath printed in the minds of subiects all loyall and reuerent respect towards their most worthy *Soueraigne*, and in the hearts of Inferiours all dutifull regard of their honourable *Superiours*, that you shoulde vtter such blasphemie against Gods sacred *Ministers*, and so noble and so flourishing estate as this is. He that priuiledged this, deserues hee should priuiledge no more. You thought to lade your *Exorcist* with the enuy of so odious a comparison: but all wise men will see, your selues are the *Exorcist*, and all the rest of the persons in your books, whom ye make to speake what and how ye please: and therefore whatsoever they offende, they ought to be whipped on your backs. I take not vpon me to define of the *seuerall orders of diuels* further then the sacred word of truth is my guide. You contrariwise, that you might oppose your selues against me, sticke not to bend your forces against the verie Scriptures. For you will haue nothing now amongst them, but a *meere confusion, and a state without all order*: notwithstanding our Saviour teacheth, that the power of darknesse is a kingdome: that there is a Prince of this kingdom called *Beelzebub*, and inferiour degrees called his *Angels* (which whether they be all of them equall, or no without distinction or difference in any respect whatsoever, you should haue considered from these words, *He taketh vnto him seuen other spirits worse then himselfe*, & not vainly to haue trifled about the word *Exusia*, that there is a kind of policie of concord maintained amongst them, whereby this kingdom is vpholden. These things are plainly taught, and are such as no Christian may gain ay, yet you would ouerthrow all this, strining for such a blended mingle amongst them, as is viterly void of any the least distinction. But it is a true saying, *Foolles whilest they labour one euill to shun, into the contrarie presently runne*. VWhereas in these words, *This kind goeth not forth*

pag. 138

pag. 140. &amp;c

Matt. 12. 25

Ec. &amp; 25

41.

but by prayer & fasting. I haue obserued foure things: That there are two kinds of diuels: That one is more difficultly expelled then the other: that the child was possessed with one of the worse kind: that thence partly it was wherefore the Disciples cast him not forth: you returre. They which want ayte to analyze the Scriptures, may here learne to be-  
*pag. 154.*  
 butcher a text, with Rhetorike ill be seeming vnmanly clownes. But tell me, is there no difference between Analyzing, and making collections from a text? Prate no more of the extraordinary faith  
*pag. 155.*  
 of the Disciples, except you can make it good by sound reason they were indued with such kind of faith at that time. Our Sauour faith there was an *Apissia* in them, a thorough defect, whereby only they failed in that extraordinary course they attempted.

But now you wil shew the impieties, absurdities and dangers which follow of this doctrine. I first, it is impiety to avouch any thing for truth that is not. I acknowledge it is a greate impiety: but this doctrine doth not so. Secondly, Lying wonders are the marks of Antichrist. I answere, you ly falsly, when you make the casting forth of Satan by prayer and fasting to be a lying wonder. Thirdly, it is impiety to affirm fasting and prayer (ex opere operato) may effect such a worke. It is impiety indeed, but you may as truly charge me with this affirmation, as you might charge any sound hearted Christian that knowes *M. Deacon*, with affirming that he is an honest man. Fourthly, it is impiety to prophane prayer and fasting without warrant from the word. We graunt also this, but withall ioyned vnto it. That it is no lesse impiety to call that prophaning of prayer and fasting, which is warranted by the word, as in this case it is. Lastly, it is impiety (say you) to make prayer and fasting which of God are appointed to bee helpes vnto faith, a sole meanes without faith for expelling of diuels. I subscribe vnto it and wish with all my heart, that he which faith so may receive the reward of a deceiver: but if such cogitation was euer farre from my breast, that such impudent slanderers might be branded in their foreheads with this marke: *False accusers of their brethren*. I doubt not but you haue read these words of the Discourer, (who neuer speaketh vntruly for mee, whatsoeuer hee doth against me) *M. Darrell* confesseth the necessitie of faith in the ordinarie means. *Disco. pa. 45.*  
 Your absurdities (for so they are indeed) with the dangers partly foolishly, & partly falsly imagined, what should I vouchsafe to repeat them? I will leave these and such like to the Reader, able now by that which hath bene saide, for all your maske to discern you.

pag. 159,

You vpbraide me with *hiding my selfe for feare of perill*. I haue learned by the commandement and example of Christi Iesus himselfe, his Apostles, and of the Martyrs in all ages, that I may, nay, ought to giue place to the rage of man, especially not forsaking in the meane season any duty that concernes me. Yet that you may know I am not cleane runne away, by that time you haue read my *Sworne* and this Reply, tell me whether you haue not met with some bodie to cope with in the field. You will not allow Christians, if they *perceiue not their first end: uours to preuaile, to betake themselves to further humiliation*. whereas this is the practise of the Saints, as to continue their supplications till the Lord haue graunted, so to increase their exercise, the more difficult they proue the Lord to be. First, David besought the Lord for his child, & as it may seeme without fasting: then not obtaining, he ioyned fasting and watching withall: thirdly, he continued the like till the seuenth day. Did hee intend a seuen dayes fast in the beginning? Concerning the *efficacie of prayer and fasting*, we haue the same Coleworts sod againe. You talke, as if I made *prayer and fasting for dispossession, an unwritten ordinance*: whereas I onely suppose, that if it were not expressly set downe, yet for that it is to be collected out of the generall places of Scripture, as where the Lord doth summon vs, in the day of our affliction vnto weeping and mourning, to baldnesse and girding with sackcloth: and to call vpon him in the time of our aduersitie, and such like: and because also by experience we proue it to be effectually, this were sufficient warrant to vs for the ordinance of God in this behalfe. You might therefore haue spared your paines in proouing the *sufficiencie of the worde of God*, till you mette with some Papist, in which number I thanke the Lord I am not.

pag. 160

2. Sam. 12.  
16, 17.

pa. 161. &amp;c,

Isa. 22. 12.

pag. 167

For your demaunds, *If dispossession be now ordinarie, what be the things ordinary in it*. To satisfie you (though you litle deserue it) for the *medicine*, I answere it is fasting and prayer: the *operation*, is the mightie power and wil of God, apprehended instrumentally by our faith: the *ministeriall hand* to apply this *medicine*, is the *assembly* of Christians gathered for this purpose: *The theorie or skill to direct this hand*, is the knowledge that they bee warranted in so doing from the worde of God: *the meanes to imprint this skill in those physicians breasts*, are the meanes of knowledge, hearing, reading, meditating, *the habit of this skill* is their faith, which is more confirmed by the often practise of the Church in all times. Nowe then, if you cannot see what is ordinary in this worke, Bewaile your *ordinarie*

blindnesse,

blindesse which will not suffer you to behold the truth. That which followeth is no lesse foolish then false, which you take of *saith working ex opere operato*: as also that fasting and prayer cure by way of miracle: that fasting and prayer is no supernaturall manner of cure: & that if it be supernaturall, then it is extraordinarie. Is it possible for men to dote in this manner? But if the light that is in men bee darknesse, how great is their darknesse?

To the testimonies of ancient & later writers alleaged by me, you answer first, that I wrest open their mouths, and make them speak what I please. It is true, they speake what I please, because in this matter I speake nothing but what pleaseth the. but you insinuat that I peruert them. If you could haue shewed one syllable this way, al the world should haue heard of it. Besides, you haue already testified in your former Discourses, that they spake, as I report the. Secodly, you say, they speake nothing at all to my purpose in hand. My purpose in alleaging them was to shew, first, that men in these dayes may be disposed of diuels. Secondly, that fasting & prayer haue bene vsed by the most learned and godly in the Church from time to time, since miracles ceased, for expelling of Satan out of the possessed. Nowe whether they spake to these purposes or no, because your selues haue lost your eyesight, let others that can iudge of colours say what they thinke. Your third answer is, that I haue not their owne examples or practise, but only their bare reports concerning the practise of some others conuersing among them. This likewise is vnttrue. Tertullian and Cyprian reckon themselues in the number of them which did expell diuels. And Chrysostome was present in the congregation, and preached two seuerall dayes at least, when publike prayers were made for expelling of Satan out of persons possessed, brought to that ende into the Church at the commandement of the Deacon. And therefore wee haue these three mens practise. But admit that none of them had made mention of their owne practise, might not their iudgment & counsell that seruient prayers are to be vsed for the healing of the possessed suffice? specially seeing diuers of them adde, that they haue knowne some that haue bene healed by the prayers of the godly. Fourthly, say you, they giue their aduise for the exercise of prayer al one. And this is your fourth lye, for some of them mention prayer & fasting. Thus much for reply to your generall answers, let vs nowe heare those which be particular. To Origen you answer, that he insinuateth, *scilicet* the supposed efficacye of fasting and prayer, but putteth downe no practise of it as of a perpetuall ordinance. Marke how false lyers faulter in their speech.

pag. 168

Mat. 6. 2.

Doct. 58

pag. 169.

speech, Did *Origen* suppose such an efficacy of fasting and prayer & yet not thinke it was Christs ordinance, and to be vled? Whence could it haue efficacy, but from Christ? Or to what purpose was efficacy, to no vse? He therefore that acknowledgeth the lawfull efficacy of fasting and prayer, doth also acknowledge, that there is an ordinance of fasting & prayer to such an end. *Tertullian* you say, *Speakes of inanie pretended deliuerances from Satan, but sheweth not the manner how they were freed from them.* What? doth *Tertullian* in his Apologie of Christianitie against the Gentils, to the whole state of Rome, alleage certaine counterfeit deliuerances from Satan, to countenance Christian religion with? Doth he vse such policie in writing to the Gouernour *Scapula*, to gaine credite to the profession of the Gospell? Surely you are either not well in your wits, or which is worse, you haue for filthy lucre sake conspired to make but meere fables of the great works of God. But he sheweth not, say you, the manner how they were delivered. Do you sticke at this matter? you will not haue it by miracle in any sort: and therefore, say wee, by fasting and prayer. Nay but, will you say, if it were at all, it was by Miracle, and Miracles were ceased before his dayes. Therefore speake plainly, and tell *Tertullian* to his face that he lyes, that hee deluded the world with his pretended deliuerances. This is your meaning: and this answer would be short. How *Cyprian* is to be vnderstoode, we shall know (say you) by *Iames Pammelius*, who telleth vs, That the Exorcists office was not then in anie vse of the church, because that office being ioyned with the gift of Miracles, did continue but for a time. I do not alleage *Cyprian* for the office of Exorcists, but for the casting forth of diuels in those dayes, which he testifieth plainly, saying, And the diuels by tormentes of words are cast out of bodies possessed. To this adde, if you will *Pammelius* his testimonie, that miracles were then ceased, and so we conclude, That there were casting forth of diuels in *Cyprians* time, & yet not miraculous. But yet for *Iames Pammelius* let me tell you thus much: wheras you alleage his words for the ceasing of Exorcists before that time, and also that a little after he should say, That the crafts and iugling sleights of counterfeit Exorcists & coniuering priests, they are long since apparantly euident: yea euen to the very eyes of the blind: I maruelled greatly to heare these words of *Iames Pammelius*: I knew he affirms the cleane contrary, maintaining strongly by testimony of Antiquitie that office of Exorcising both of Spirits possessing, and in Baptisme. I turned my *Cyprian*, but I could find no such words of his. And therefore either you

*Cyp. Epist. 55  
& 76. edit.  
Pammel.  
Antwerp.  
in ed. b. Petri  
Beltrii 1589*



you haue met with an edition later then the last, or els you are as notable in belying mens writings as the most shamelesse Papist of them all. To the rest, as *Chryostome*, *Peter Martyr*, *Kemnitius*, *Phil. Melancthon*, *Beza*, *Vogellius*, *Danaus*, *Chassanius*, all of them most plainly testifying dispossession, and that by meanes of fasting and prayer, you answere not one word, but for the lenght of their footings, referre vs to that which hath beene spoken of the former. Indeede the'e treade in the steps of the former, and of all the godly learned that went before them & therfore by them we may gesse their footings: and so likewise by your three wiles answers to the three former we may easily gesse what would be your answer to these, namely all the absurd shiftes you could deuise to elude their testimonies, as not hauing in purpose to find out the truth, or to yeld to it beeing found, but by hook and by crook to maintaine your owne giddy fancies, whatsoeuer eyther Scripture, or any other shall saye against it. What doe I therfore disputing with such companions, which make not truth their end, but some other peruerse respect, I know not well, what? Surely Christian Reader, that which I do is for thy good, to laye open vnto thee their vnconscionable iuglings, least by any coloured pretences thou shouldst be beguiled by them. Did not I wel to bind the to their good behavior by a publike Instrument in their *Discourses*? Thou seest they haue not one worde of truth to saye against the practise of the Church of God from the Apostles time till now. But you are weary of these authentically witnesses and therfore betake your selues againe to your wored reasonings, where you may haue more scope of words, and more hope to darken the truth.

If, say you, *prayer and fasting bee an established ordinance, then it should be alwayes effectnall.* I answere, yow seldome bring an If but there is a lye in the end of it. The prophet complayneth, *How long Lord wilt thou hide thy face for ever?* Because *Dauid* obtained not by his sute his finnes life, he might by this rule haue bid praye and fasting adue. Infinite are the instances: it is meruaile you could meet with none of them, to cause you to hold in so grosse an vntruth. But I crie you mercy, you meane effectuall in regard of vttermost issue, not of the present time. Now then frame your reason *The ordinance of god is alwayes effectuall, prayer & fasting is not alwayes effectuall, & so not god his ordinance in this case.* I answere, if you take *Effectuall* for the last issue and such help as is expedient, you say vntruly of prayer and fasting: If you meane *Effectuall* for sensible,

pag. 170.

2. Sam. 12.

18

pag. 171,

172, 173.

sensible, imagined and present helpe, then is it as false, you say of gods ordinance. And this if you mark it, will suffice for all you prattle about this matter. So likewise how *Dispossession now is no miracle* enough hath beene spoken, except you can bring vs something of more weight, then hitherto you haue done. Further obserue that here they spare not to denie (though in as couert tearmes as they can) the witness of *Tertullian, Cyprian, Chrysostome*, and of all the rest before alleaged, or that can be. Moreover, it this will not serue, for compendioulnesse sake, and more securitie of their cause, they deny the conclusion. The argument is, *If dispossession by prayer and fasting be miraculons, then Tertullian, Cyprian, Chrysostome, and others wrong be miracles, when they expelled diuels after this sort: but this is false: and therefore the first.* To this you answer, *Secondly, if it be true that here tofore or now Spirits bee expelled by sole prayer and fasting, then is the worke a miracle: which is the contrarie affirmation to the conclusion.* When you talke of *sole prayer and fasting*, you haue a secret meaning of your owne of *sole prayer without faith*. Concerning which I tell you again, that if *M. Walker* & you haue such a kind of prayer and such a kind of faith, as vsually are separated one from another, you may do well to dispute of such matters betwene your selues, for my part I allowe no such prayer, neither doth the Church of God.

You argue, *that dispossession is not by historicall or temporary faith, because God hath appointed it to miraculons faith: which thing if it had beene proued in the beginning, we had done long since.* Further, you see not wherein *instituting faith* should be far better then *Temporary*, if this doth cast out diuels, as if to cast out diuels out of the bodies of men, were all in all. Besides, if *historicall faith* be sufficient, diuels might cast out diuels. But what if they will not? you are neuer a whit the nearer. Such trumpeterie shal haue no other answer. For answer to your fourth reason I say, a reprobate may apprehend the mercies of God the Creator, but not of God the Redeemer, And such apprehension for the eiecting of Satan may suffice.

You slander me, when you say, that in *dispossession of Sommers* we purposely prayed to teach the beholders, that the work was effected by the onely power of him to whome we put vp our prayer. But what is it to say you slander me? You make no more account to slander me, then to fillip me. Againe I doe not say, that parties bewitched haue no warrant from the Scripture to fast & praye, (as is apparant in the place by you quoted, where I counsell them to this holy exercise) but only, that ther is not such expresse mention in the word  
for

pag. 174. 175

pag. 176.

pag. 177

pag. 179.

pag. 182

pag. 183.  
184. 185

for the curing of the n, as for parties possessed. And therefore all that is an idle dispute which you purpose for diuers pages together in this matter. You would faine haue me a companion in this wicked assertion, which your selues maintain as is apparant afterwards. *pag. 186*  
 But note (good reader) for an egregious blasphemy, that these *Answ*ers make the Lord guiltie of the horrible sins comitted by the wicked in seeking to the diuell for help in their miseries. For how doe they proue it to be an absurditie to cond<sup>m</sup> mine peoples going to the diuel for helpe? Surely thus, *If it be a sinne to seeke help of the diuel, we shall make the Lord guiltie of this sin without whom it cannot be done.* I haue seelt what blasphemie this proposition containeth: for it plainly affor deth that which before I say. And the Conclusion, to wit, it is no sinne to seeke helpe of the diuel, is a conclusion of monstrous impietie. So where they would proue, *There is no warrant from the worde for prayer and fasting to be vsed in behalfe of parties bewitched,* *pag. 188* where argument is of this sorte. *If there be no warrant from the worde that sole prayer & fasting haue any power of themselves ex opere operato, to remoue supernaturall iudgements of God, then there is no warrant for parties bewitched to vse fasting and prayer as helpesfull in this case.* But the first, say they, is true, & therefore the second. But what do you sticke at parties bewitched? You should haue inferred generally, there is no warrant nor vse of fasting and prayer at al for any thing *ex opere operato*. O men stricken with the blindness of Sodome. which before the dore, seek the dore, and cannot find it. Is it your foolishnes, that you cannot tell what you auouch? Or your shamelesnes, that you passe not though your names should be deseruedly odious to all? Or is it, that you do so far despise all the learned of this land, that you thinke there is not one man able to discearne such prodigious falshood? Such wretched persons would rather be confuted with a three corded whip, then by the writings, or wordes of any. And if that will not serue, it were meete such order might be taken with you that the Church of God sustaine no damge by you.

Whether I haue so fondly trauersed this question of possession as you *pag. 190* say, I leane it to the godly learned to determine, to whose censure I willingly submit my selfe both in this & in al other my writings. But as for your iudgments I passe ot. First make it appeare, you haue eyes in your owne heads, before you take vpon you to tell what is straight, or croked in me. then sanctifie your mouths by confessing, your lyes, your sclanders, your blasphemies, before you giue sentence

tence of any my doings. In the mean season, if you will needs be barking, I will find such a bone for you to gnaw on, as shall be fit for your chaps,

pag. 191, 192  
93.

Concerning the counsell I gave for fasting and prayer, it was grounded from hence: that in all iudgements (of which kind possession is) we are called to humiliation, for which I cite in the margine an induction of diuers examples. To which you answered first, that without particular knowledge of the iudgement, prayers could not be made in faith to remove it: which is one of those Axioms that neuer fails you, such an one as Abahs prophets were inspired with, when they counselled him to warre against Ramoth. Shall not the poore countrey sicke man pray to God for some comfort in his distresse, because he doth not know particularly the nature of his disease? Secondly, that the quoted Scriptures onely testifie the peoples humiliation by prayer and fasting, so oft as any strange iudgement was inflicted, but proue not essentiall possessions and dispossessions by those means. yet they proue the counsell I gave was warrantable, and this I content my selfe with. It is enough if my poore premises afforde mee one naturall and orderly conclusion at one time. Every mans Cow can not bring forth colts, as yours do.

pag. 194.  
195. 196.

To conclude, you tell vs your great confidence in the cause, which no man needs to doubt of, if he consider your former arrogant boldnesse: nor much maruell at as strange, if he call to minde your vncredible blindnesse. But if your learning and conscience were more, your confidence would be a great deale lesse. Then you inferre of the premises, That if there be no possession, nor dispossession now by fasting and prayer, how greatly they haue erred that haue anouched it, and how much they are to be blamed who cannot endure it should be impugned. But contrariwise say I, if all these things be true, which you denie, as hath beene proued by stronger reason, then you possibly withstand, what doe you deserue which haue troubled the Church with newe and singular opinions in these points, and in broaching them, haue offered to the world to choke them withall other verie many grosse, fantastickall and impious absurdities? and yet you dare intitle your fooleries, The infallible truth, and such, as Glory & praise is to be giuen to the Lord for these his lately reuealed counsels by you concerning these intricate questions. O intolerable proud ignorance! Haue you by late reuelation cleared these intricate questions? Indeed your assertions be late for they were neuer heard of in the Church before: but they were neuer reuealed vnto you by the Spirit of truth, but

but by that lying spirit, whose image doth lively appeare almost in euery argument you handle. And yet that my selfe be not onely iudge, let any man of vnderstanding waigh with equal balance that litle that hath beene *replied*, & compare it with yours, & then giue sentence: whether any since the time of our peace by our gracious Quene, professing the gospell, hath published any writing of diuinitie that doth come neare these your treatises in number of vn-sound notions, in misconstructions & wrestings of Scriptures, in absurd collections, in impudent reiecting the authoritie of the ancient, in shamelesse pretending the names of good authours against their owne meanings, in childish stumbling in the first rudiments of Arts, in most frequent lying and slaundering, and which is greatest of all, in dangerous and scandalous assertions mixed with some notorious blasphemies: and then it may be you shall carie the bell of all that haue written in our times. Great cause there is we should all make bonafires for the publishing of your bookes, or rather of your published bookes: but especially *M. Bishop*, who got the priuilege ad *imprimendum solum*, I belecue he beshrewes your sin-gers for it.

## A REPLIE TO THE THIRD DIALOGVE,

**Y**our *Vses* are 'sutable to your doctrine. For what other thing can proceede from a Cockatrices egge, then a serpent? Yet *Lycanthropus* admires and applaudes them: and so perhaps may some doe, that be not well in their wits. But they which haue receiued the appointing, that teacheth vs concerning all things, will abhorre your prodigious dotage, and the more when they consider your *vses*, which manifest plainly that your errors be not about strawes and rushes, such as without danger might be contemned and neglected, but which draw after them most perillous consequences, mightily shaking the verie foundation, and chiefeest pillars of our faith. You pretend that this your doctrine of small determination of possessions & dispossessions of Spirits and Diuels, affordeth first, an holy meditation concerning the vndoubted faithfulnessse and truth of our eternall God, in that he promising four thousand years fully before, to send the seed of a woman, which should bruiſe the serpents head, hath in his owne de-

1. *Iob.* 2. 27.

*termind time fulfilled the same, by sending his sonne.* We beleue and know it, that not one iote of the Lordes promise hath failed, but doth your doctrine yeeld any confirmation of it? Nay verily, but doth vtterly ouerthrow it, and make the Lord of truth to haue falsified his word. The Lord hath promised by sending his sonne fully to subdue and vanquish Satan: your doctrine doth teach vs, that Christ by his death hath onely made an end of possessions and dispossessions of diuels, that is, that he hath only deliuered *Demoniakes* such as were actually tormented in their bodies by the Diuell. What? Are all the Elect *Demoniakes*? Haue you not taught vs, that Possessions were very rare before Christs time, and that it was *verie* probable there were none at all in Israel, till a little before his comming, and none after the Apostles? Are only then these men deliuered by Christs death? You haue quit the Lord indeed wel of his promise. He promised the breaking of Satans head, you make that Christ hath scarce pulled one lock of haire frō his head. He promised deliuerance for al his elect, you restrain this deliuerance only to men actually posselt with diuells. He promised vs a gift, as it were of an hundred thousand talents: you make him to haue satisfied his promise in bestowig vpon vs an hundred pence. Do men satisfy bondes in such manner? Doth a Creditor, to whome is owing a thousand pound, hold himselfe contented in receauing two or three shillings? Eye vpon your comfort: you are miserable comforters: But this determination, you say, of Satans *Actual possession* may *confirm faith and hope for the vtter subuersion of the whole kingdom of darknes.* I answer, you ly falsly, if your doctrine be true. For hope can expect no more then faith doth presently imbrace, but by your teaching, faith doth not imbrace a ful vanguishing of satans kingdome by Christs death, but onely an end of Actual possessions (which neither was accomplished, as hath bene shewed) and therefore hope cannot looke for any further subuersion of Satans kingdome then is alreadie. Now let the godly iudge what lyeth hid in your doctrine, whether they be things to be tolerated, and coolly dealt in or no: or rather of such nature, that if you will not reclaime them, all louers of the truth ought to spit in your faces in detestation of your errors. So likewise when you speak of God his al sufficiency, of Christs triumph, and of the Diuels captiuitie, who so euer trusts to your doctrine in these poynts, shall perceauie he leanes vpon a staffe of reede, which when hee shall stand in neede of it will breake a sunder, and run through his body, as may sufficient ly

ly be seene by this little, that I haue nowe remembred, as also by that hath beene more fully declared, in Suruey of your Sixt Dialogue. your vses then are wretched, and therefore I leaue them.

The proper vse that can be made of your doctrine is, that Christians should now shew their wisdom in practising that rule our Sauiour Christ hath taught them, namely this, *beware of false prophets which come to you in sheepes clothing, but inwardly they are rauening wolues.* Thou hast seene in this book of theirs, good Reader, these men professing themselves; *The Lord his vnworthiest on earth:* In the subscription to three of their Epistles. when they beginne their disputations, to begin the same with prayer, recreating themselves with singing of psalmes: to wish the *Reue.* rend brethren if they haue faulted either in matter or manners to console them and spare not, withall desiring the blessing of God to light on their bea:ts for their labour that way: to haue vsed many wordes of goodly pretence, of great obedience to the magistrate, of great care of their brethrens good, of great syceritie in calling euery thing to the triall of the Scripture, and many such other faire shewes. *Dial. Discou. pag. 7, 262. Epist. Dedi. Ans.*

On the other side thou mayst see by this *Suruey* and *Reply* what abundance of vile and grosse errors is packed vp in these their treatises, What little conscience they make of god his truth, Of lying & slandering, how exceedingly they haue trifled in ech seuerall poynt, and now by these vses how all tendes to this, to discredit God his truth in fulfilling his promise, to impeach his sufficiency for vanquishing of satan, to restrain Christs triumph to a thing of nothing, to limit Satans captiuitie with loosing of a skonse, and such like: which thinges beeing thus, now it will shortly and easily more appeare, whither these men be false prophets, or no. For if they shal recant themselves of their errorrs, and as they haue giuen publike scandall to the Church, in labouring to draw men after their fanacies, so againe in submission to the truth, disclame all such opinion dissonant from the sacred word, throwing the first stone at themselves, to the end all other may beware of them, then they shall be manifested haue toslipped but of infirmities, and to be such indeed, as they would seeme. Otherwise if they will still maintaine & defend them, then thou seeest good reader, these mens sheepes clothing, and how for thy sake I haue pulled it ouer their eares, wherby thou mayest behold them to be inwardly rauening wolues: if they be to be iudged wolues, not only which rent the members of our bodies in sunder, but also & much more they, which by infecting men with pestiferous opinions, deliuer the to satan to be



torne in peeces both bodies and soules. In this case it will behooue, the Christian Magistrate, both Ciuill & Ecclesiasticall, to take order, that such cruel devouring beasts may be driven from Christs fold: & that they would consider, that they make not dissensions & scandales contrary to the doctrine we haue learned, which stand for the truth, but they which oppugne the truth. It is the rebell that makes ciuill war: the faithful subiects wepons are not against the peace but for the peace, neither is it the dog barking in the night, that disturbs the shepherdes, but the wolues approaching: the keepers stirring is to be commended, & the theues assaulting he is to be defended. This vse then the Magistrate is to make of your doctrine: generally all the Christians of this land, are to take it as a watchword to auoyd you as Scorpions, that they may know you to be men, which haue made your bellies your god, & to glory in your shame: which haue a forme of godlynes & haue denied the power of it, whose moutnes speake proude things, hauing the persons of men in admiration for aduantage sake. These manner of men are fortold should come in these last dayes, & our Church doth already feele it by lamentable experience. If thou shalt make this vse, Christian reader of their booke it shall not bee altogether vnprofitable for thee. For *It must needes be that heresies should come, that they which are approved among vs may be knowne.* The Lord therefore strengthen vs so many as be of this number, to stand for his truth, and giue, vs wise dome to discern those which would craftily, vndermine

it, that all such wicked workers beeing defeated, wee may constantly walke in the puritie of it, till the day of our Lorde Iesus Christ, to whom, with the father and the holy Spirit be all honour and praise for euer.

Amen.

FINIS

*Phil. 3. 19.*

*2. Tim. 3. 5.*

*Iud. 16.*

*1. Cor. 11. 19*

More followeth my answer to the Contradictions  
they charge mee with.

The Discouersers charging me with a shamefull companie of Contradictions, no lesse then fiftie; I first framed an answer to them, with full purpose to publish it, & therein haue made it plaine there is not a contradiction. But this my Treatise prouing much larger then I intended, & the answer to them being of litle or no vse, saue only to cleare my selfe of this slander, and to discouer their fithinesse, which needeth not, I thought good rather to suppress, then publish it: yet so as I will giue thee, good Reader, a taste thereof, and of their vpright dealing herein, assuring thee of my credit, that euen such be the rest of their contradictions.

contradiction  
13.

Darell, say they, in his Doctrine pag. 54. saith, that prayer and fasting being used aright, will certainly prosper either to the removing or sanctifying of the iudgement. But pag. 56. he saith, there is no assurance to preuaile.

Answer.

I answer. There is no assurance to preuaile, that is, we can not be sure the partie shall be deliuered, the meanes being used, for so are my wordes. Had then I sayd pag. 54. fasting will certainlie prosper to the removing of the iudgement, and no more, I had contradicted that I say, pag. 59. but adding, or sanctifying, a child may see here is no contradiction. Such a contradiction is this: Certenly the Discouersers will euer be ashamed of their contradictions. or their sinne is the greater: Assuredly they will not be ashamed of their contradictions. And this: The sun is either vnder a cloud, or set. It is not vnder a cloud.

contradiction 3.

In his Detection 163. Darrell saith, fire hath power to burne, & in the same pag. hath no power to burne.

All that we reade Detection 163. is that Sorners band being in the fire was not burnt. Would euer any man, these two excepted, hence collect a contradiction? How many thousands in this land haue said the same, and among them not a few that be learned, & yet I dare say neither learned. nor vnlearned euer feared they spake contraries. Shadrach, Meshach, & Abednego being in the fire were not burnt, and yet they that cast them into the fire were burnt. I trust you wil not say here is a contradiction. But confesse both these to be true. Fire naturally burneth, but restrained by God the ouer-ruler o' nature, it doth not burne. Secondly, you should first haue shewed where I say, Fire hath power to burne, before you told vs that I speake contraries.

Ans.

contrad. 24.

In his Doctrine pag. 2. he saith, that it sweeteth altogether with Satans nature to be filthy or wicked in speech. But Detection 175. he saith, that it sweeteth as well with his nature to vse good and holy Speeches.

My wordes Detection 175. be, Holy wonder haue bene uttered by Satans. Tell me is this a false proposition? Or yet this: vnclane and blasphemous speeches sute excellently with the nature of the vnclane spirit. If both these be true, which none will deny, with what truth doe you say that I speake contraries, whereof the one must needs be false? These men sure had forgot when they doted of this contradiction, that the diuel is as well by nature subtil, (and in his subtiltie ready to transforme him selfe into Angel of light) as vnclane and wicked. Of this stampe they haue 18 contradictions more.

contrad. 11.

In his Doctrine 47. He saith the disciples by vertue of their so large a commission could cast out a diuel of any kinde. But pag. 50. the Lunatike child was possesed with one of the worst kinde of spirits, and thus abence it came the disciples could not cast him out.

Ans,

To make this contradiction they haue detracted part of my words in either proposition. In the former these, if their saith failed not: which words, or words to the same effect in the aforesaid pag. 47. & the two pages precedent I vse no lesse then twelue times. In the latter proposition where I say, abence partly it came, they detract this word partly: whereby I intimate the Disciples saith did at that time faile them, when they could not cast the diuel out of the lunatike child, so that their incredulitie was one let, which oft els where I expresse. And this you well knewe, as appeareth by your next contradiction, the twelfth I meane. What meant you then thus to separate and rent asunder those words which of purpose I had coupled together? And by detracting that which in either of the propositions is so materiall, and in the one I intreate so often, to pretend a contradiction where you knew none was? Who hath bewitched you to vse such cursed deuises, for the compassing of your contradictions? A cursed pretence must this needes be, seeing it can not be done in ignorance. For you cannot be ignorant hercof, that the wordes detracted by you I vse d, specially those so oft iterated, and that in those pages from whence you haue the saide contradictory proposition: considering also that to make another contradiction you aleg the very same words you omit here, & that fro the same page, as witnesseth the contradiction here following. Neither can you be ignorant of this, that these wordes being vsed and added by me, I am not contrary to my selfe, yea hence it is that you did

omit

omit them. It must needs therefore be that you knowing here was no contradiction, haue against that knowledge of yours (by this deuise of detracting these words) made yet a faire shew to the world of a contradiction. Here is no contrarietie except these be propositions contradictory: *The Disciples could cast out a diuell of any kind, if their faith sayled not: The Disciples their faith sailing could not cast the diuell out.*

In his Doctrine 47. be faith the Apostles faith sailed not: But pag. 48 be faith it sailed at this time when Christ spake to them and in this very worke. contrad, 31.

These wordes, *the Apostles faith sailed not*, you could omit, when such omission serueth for your purpose, as appeares by the former contradiction. But now when they must stand you in some steade, they are not to seeke. He wanteth the vse of one of his senses, that smelleth not here your stinking breath. My wordes be these. They were able to cast out all diuels, if their faith sayled not: which imply not that the Apostles faith neuer sailed them, as you would haue it, for otherwise here is no contradiction, but rather the contrary, that their faith did at some times saile them. Again, though these words *The Apostles faith sailed not*, with the former are mine, yet thus rent and separated from their fellowes, I may trulye say they are not mine. In your Discourses you say, if the skyes fall we shall haue larks. By your wise rule you there affirme, that the skyes do fall: & in the lie booke pag. 24. where you haue these words: If Angels be vncreated, then are they eternall: you affirme, that Angels be vncreated: yet pag. 28. you say Angels be created. These propositions be contradictory, and the former of them absurd, and so here is a contradiction (forsooth) and an absurditie, when indeed there is neither. Here is paltie and childish stuffe. If I would walke but in this one crooked step of yours, how easily could I make a booke of your contradictions, and another of your absurdities. But suppose I had said no more then you produce: vz. *The Apostles faith sailed not*: fro thence ye could not inferre a contradiction, except I had spoken of the same time mentioned in the latter contradictorie proposition. Their faith might not saile them at one time, and yet saile them at another time.

In Doctrine 52. *Abrahams prayer is made a sole meanes of conception and procreation of children*: But pag. 60 another meanes is found appointed of God for that purpose, or els it would proue a miracle. contrad, 15.

As before by detracting, so here by adding you abuse both mee, Ans.  
and

and the Reader: The words I vse be these *Who will deny but that as the sinne of Abimelech (in taking Sarah, Abrahams wife vnto him) had sort vpon every wombe of the house of Abimelech, so the prayr of Abraham was the meane whereby they were opened, & that iudgement taken away.* Do I here make *Abrahams prayr* a sole meanes of procreation? That I meane & affirme is, that by *Abrahams prayr* as a meanes *Abimelech* his wyfe & women seruants, were made able to conceiue, which before they could not, not excludng, but including the knowlege and seede of man: which no man in his right minde would hence gather, this couple excepted

contrad, 46,

In his Doctrin pag. 2. he saith, it is absurd to affirme that the diucl (being without a man) can dispose of the whole or any parte of mans bodie: but Detection, page 11. he saith that the diucl (in all probability) did vse *Sommers* his tongue, notwithstanding he was essentiallie and sensiblie playing boe peepe vnder the couerleed.

Ans,

The former proposition is not mine. I say every part, you saye, any part. And so by altering a word you haue made a contradiction where none is: except there be no other part of *Sommers* his body, besides his tongue.

And thus to thee Reader, but for breuitie. I would make it euident, that of the *discouersers* fiftie contradictions. being examined one by one, there is not so much as one to be found. The greater is their sinne and shame who chraged me with so many.

And here we are to obserue first, that of these contradictions there are about 20. wherein there is no contradiction at all, taking them at the hucksters hand, euen as the nselues haue quoted them. And namely these: contradiction 4. 6. 7. 8. 13. 14. 17. 18. 19. 21. 23. 24. 26. 28. 31. 35. 38. 36. 37. 41. & 45

Secondly, to marke the seuerall deuises or sleights whereby they make semblance of contradictions when there are indeed none if you take the words as they be set downe in my treatises. This semblance they make.

1 By *forgetting* that I neuer affirmed (but often the contrary) as in contradiction 1. 9. 17. 19. 20. 23. 25. 26. 27. 35. & 46.

2 By *omitting* or *detracting* some worde or words material, as in contradiction 3. 11. 12. 25. 27. 30. 31. 33. 36. 39. & 40

3 By *adding*, and thus haue they done in contradiction 5. 43. & 47.

By

4 By altering, as appeareth by contradiction 6, 17, 27, 29, 49

5 To this said end also, when both their contradictory propositions are in the same page, and sometimes in the very same sentence, they runne notwithstanding for the one of them to a page far off, or happellie to another booke: Hereby (I meane by alleaging two distinct pages of mine, somewhat also afunder) pretending, that what I say in one place, forgetting forsooth my self, I gaynsay in another. As appeareth by contradiction 1. 3. 5. 22. 26. 36. 42. & 47.

I hus haue these men so accalltomed and taught themselves to falsifie my writings in whole or in part: by *forging, detracting, adding, & altering*, as they haue alleaged very litle of mine truly: & no maruel: because truly alleaged they would not make for their purpose Yet notwithstanding they haue by these cursed meanes compassed their *contradictions*, I doubt not but that they please themselves greatly, and glory in them, specially in the great number of them, and doe thinke therein they haue shewed not a litle wit. But I will tel you, a very foole that will giue libertie to himself to *adde, detract, and alter* but here & there a letter, may easily make a thousand *contradictions*, where none are: much more he that wil do thus by wordes & sometimes by sentences; as you haue done.

VWhether now you haue *pretermitted any thing material*, and by such *omitting, and taking what parte of my writings might make most* for your purpose, *euē purposely maymed my writings*, which you deny and I affirme, iudge thou indifferently betwene vs good reader. And whether you will *acknowledge and redresse the offered wrong*, whereof I complaine, and which I trust to be a *wrong* I haue made manifest by this my *Replie*, vnto all men, & to your owne consciences, as you pretend you will, nay, seeme to abhorre not to do it, if once the *wrong* shal be made to appeare, saving *God forbid that we should not doe it very willingly*: in time both thou and I shall know. And thus much for answer to their supposed *contradictions*. For breuitie sake I omit my reply to the *Absurdities* wherewith you charge me, and your slaunders contained in them.

Here not vnjustly may I charge you with the *contradictions & Absurdities* I find in your writings: and if it fall out so that your selues be found faultie in that, wherof vniustly you accuse another, then thereby leaue henceforward to plucke rather the beame out of your own eyes, then busie your selues so much about lesse then a mote in your brothers eye.

and the Reader: The words I vse be these *Who will deny but that as the sinne of Abimelech (in taking Sarah, Abrahams wife vnto him) had shott vp every wombe of the house of Abimelech, so the prayr of Abraham was the meane whereby they were opened, & that iudgement taken away?* Do I here make *Abrahams prayer* a sole meanes of procreation? That I meane & affirme is, that by *Abrahams prayer* as a meanes *Abimelech* his wyfe & women seruants, were made able to conceiue, which before they could not, not excluding, but including the knowlege and seede of man: which no man in his right minde would hence gather, this couple excepted

contrad, 46,

In his Doctrin: pag. 2. he saith, it is absurd to affirme that the diucl (being without a man) can dispose of the whole or any parte of mans bodie: but Detection, page 11. he saith that the diucl (in all probability) did vse Sommers his tongue, notwithstanding he was essentiallie and sensible playing boe peepe vnder the couerleed.

Ans,

The former proposition is not mine. I say every part, you saye, any part. And so by altering a word you haue made a contradiction where none is: except there be no other part of Sommers his body, besides his tongue.

And thus to thee Reader, but for breuitie. I would make it euident, that of the discourses fittie contradictions being examined one by one, there is not so much as one to be found. The greater is their sinne and shame who chraged me with so many.

And here we are to obserue first, that of these contradictions there are about 20. wherein there is no contradiction at all, taking them at the hucksters hand, euen as the selues haue quoted them. And namely these: contradiction 4. 6. 7. 8. 13. 14. 17. 18. 19. 21. 23. 24. 26. 28. 31. 35. 38. 36. 37. 41, & 45

Secondly, to marke the seuerall deuises or sleights whereby they make semblance of contradictions when there are indeed none if you take the words as they be set downe in my treatises. This semblance they make.

1 By forging that I neuer affirmed (but often the contrary) as in contradiction 1. 9. 17. 19. 20. 23. 25. 26. 27. 35, & 46.

2 By omitting or detracting some wordes or words material, as in contradiction 3. 11. 12. 25. 27. 30. 31. 33. 36. 39, & 40

3 By adding, and thus haue they done in contradiction 15. 43. & 47.

By



4 By *altering*, as appeareth by contradiction 6, 17, 27, 29, 49

5 To this said end also, when both their contradictory propositions are in the same *page*, and sometimes in the very same sentence, they runne notwithstanding for the one of them to a *page* far off, or happellie to another booke: Hereby (I meane by alleaging two distinct pages of mine, somewhat also asunder) pretending, that what I say in one place, forgetting forsooth my self, I gaynsay in another. As appeareth by contradiction 1, 3, 5, 22, 26, 36, 42, & 47.

I thus haue these men so accustomd and taught themselves to falsifie my writings in whole or in part: by *forging*, *detracting*, *adding*, & *altering*, as they haue alleaged very litle of mine truly: & no maruel: because truly alleaged they would not make for their purpose Yet notwithstanding they haue by these cursed meanes compassed their *contradictions*, I doubt not but that they please themselves greatly, and glory in them, specially in the great number of them, and doe thinke therein they haue shewed not a litle wit. But I will tel you, a very foule that will giue libertie to himself to *adde*, *detract*, and *alter* but here & there a letter, may easily make a thousand *contradictions*, where none are: much more he that wil do thus by wordes & sometimes by sentences, as you haue done.

Whether now you haue *pretermitted any thing materia*, and by such *omitting*, and *taking what parte of my writings might make most for your purpose*, even purposely *maymed my writings*, which you deny and I affirme, iudge thou indifferently betwene vs good reader. And whether you will *acknowledge* and *redresse the offered wrong*, whereof I complaine, and which I trust to be a *wrong* I haue made manifest by this my *Replie*, vnto all men, & to your owne consciences, as you pretend you will, nay, seeme to abhorre not to do it, if once the *wrong* shal be made to appeare, saying: *God forbid that we should not doe it very willingly*: in time both thou and I shall know. And thus much for answer to their supposed *contradictions*. For breuitie sake I omit my reply to the *Absurdities* wherewith you charge me, and your slaunders contained in them.

Here now vnistly may I charge you with the *contradictions* & *Absurdities* I find in your writings: and if it fall out so that your selves be found faultie in that, wherof vnistly you accuse another, then thereby learne henceforward to plucke rather the beame out of your own eyes, then busie your selves so much about lesse then a mote in your brothers eye.

In their Answer page 55 and page 179 of their Discourses, they say, that the manifestation of Christ by words and declaration of his glorious Gospel, were the main ends of possession: and a little after, that the possession of diuels were especially for these two ends. thereby insinuating that there were some other ends or end. Yet page 67 of the same booke they say, that these were the two only ends of this wonderful iudgement.

2 In their Dial. disc. page 58 they say, angels doe evermore worke after an invisible, insensible, and spiriual manner. And the next leate, page 60 they say, that angels in all their ambassages they doe either manifest themselves by seeing and hearing, or assist vs by signification by some other sensible means. And they being so flatly affirming that the angels do outwardly helpe vs by certaine visible apparitions or sights, which they propose and offer before our eyes.

3 In their Discourses pa. 42 they say, the mind it selfe, and it only is that wherein motion consisteth: and the body is but the animals organ or instrument, having naturally in it selfe no motion at all, or no further motion at the most, than of these only actions wherein the said mind (whose organ it is) employeth the same. But in page 74 of the same booke they affirme, that the body it selfe hath, and may accomplish or effect corporall operations and motions by it selfe alone, without any the direction, moderation, guidance, or consent of the soule.

4 In their Discourses pag. 116 they say, the diuell did bewitch and charme the Serpent, so that (through his craftie suggestion) hee was very wel able to procure such a diuination or sorcery, as did presently circumuent or deceiue Enah. And in the same booke page 119 they say, that a reasonable speech cannot possibly be framed or understood of any but of a mind having understanding and reason.

5 In their Answer pa. 50 they say, These eight demoniakes might be possessed, though the diuell was not essentially inherent in any one of their bodie: But page 43 of the same booke they say, The possession of diuels whatsoever is ceased long since.

6 In their Discourses 173 they say, The Apostles might authentically auouch for infallible truth whatsoever they preached. But in their Answer page 126 128 129 130 they say, that the apostles sometime failed in doctrine. And a little after: all these were their errors in doctrine and iudgement. And againe. It was expedient for the apostles to erre in some things, that is, some points of doctrine. And this they

vnderstand after the holy Ghost fell vpon them, as is plaine by the  
aforesaid pages.

7 In their *Answer* pag. 7, they say, that wonders and miracles are  
flatly confounded: but in their *Diallogicall discourses* 209, they say, the  
cruel may worke wonders, but can effect no miracles. And pag. 310,  
thus, A thing effected by spiritual means, howsoever it may be a won-  
der, yet no miracle in any respect.

8 In your *Discourses* pag. 352. for your parts you assure me, that you  
are very farre from all suspicion of a precompacted confederacie betwene  
Sonnets and me. Yet in page 42. of your *answere* you say, Why should  
we wonder at all, that two cunning companions (Meaning Sonnets  
and my selfe) confederate together before. should conclude such a course  
betwene themselves, as the one (by the helpe of the other) should prognos-  
ticate strange and incredible events.

9 In pag. 39. of their *Discourses*, they tell vs. There is not one  
sound Diuinitie that doth not vnderstand Possession as they doe, and none  
as I fondly imagine: and yet in the Epistle to the Reader prefixed  
before that booke, that which they deliuer concerning possession and  
dispossession of diuels, they call, their private opinion: and in page 195  
of their *answere*, The Lord his lately revealed counsels.

*Part of their absurd and vnsound Positions.*

- 1 God by good Angels may effect fantasticall, vaine, and filthie ef-  
fects. *Answer* 15.
- 2 Good Angels may effect vaine and filthy effects. *ibid.*
- 3 Wheresoever the Scriptures beake of Angels or diuels, they  
speake only by metaphore. *ibid.*
- 4 The Diuel hath no desire to be in any mans body. *Ans.* 22
- 5 The Iewes in Christs time did (partly) know the parties which  
were possessed, from the often reuelation of the parties them-  
selves. *answ.* 32
- 6 God by his Spirit instructed the Cananitish woman (mentioned  
Matth. 15, 22) of her daughters malice. *answ.* 53.
- 7 The manifestation of Christs deitie, and the confirmation of the  
Gospell, the only ends of Possession. *answ.* 67
- 8 Christ hath put a final end to the possession of diuels by his  
death and resurrection. *anw.* 66
- 9 The supernaturall actions or effects of the Diuel in Demoniacs,  
cannot possibly be comprehended by humane senses. *answ.* 69

- 10 The working of miracles was only in Christ and his Apostles  
dayes, *answ.* 90
- 11 God hath appointed plowing and sowing for a meanes of a-  
bundance or barrennes vpon the ground, *answ.* 172
- 12 Good angels do euermore worke after an invisible, insensible  
and spirituall manner, *Dialogical discourses* 58. This is to bee  
refuted by all those places where angels are said to haue appea-  
red and spoken in visible formes vnto men.
- 13 The body hath, and may accomplish by her selfe alone, cor-  
porall actions and motions, without anie her soules direction,  
moderation, guidance, or consent, *Dial. disc.* 74
- 14 The dead carcassee of a man, or the body being separate from  
the soule, may and doth also effect corporall actions and moti-  
ons. *ibid.*
- 15 The Diuell did so bewitch and so charme the Serpent, as that  
(through his craftie suggestion) shee was very well able to pro-  
pound such a diuination or soothsaying, as did presently circum-  
uent and deceiue *Eusab. Dial. disc.* 116. Absurd, that the Diuell  
should not onely thus make the Serpent it selfe to speake, but,  
also argue the matter like a reasonable creature
- 16 The apostles erred in some points of doctrine, after the holy  
Ghospell vpon them: Yea, it was expedient for them so to erre  
*answ.* 126, 128, 129, 130
- 17 It is verie erroriuous for anie to imagin, that the eyes may pos-  
sibly be deceiued, in discerning betweene spirits (that is, bodies  
assumed by spirits) and true naturall bodies. *Dial. disc.* 157. You  
forget that *Abraham* and *Lot* were deceiued, as appeareth by *Gen.*  
18. and 19.

## F I N I S

**I** am to craue thy patience good Reader, specially the authours, for  
the late comming forth of this booke: for I confesse it hath layen  
in my hands almost this halfe yeare.

